SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 09321 1309

D
REF
354.3225
C737p

5/S

San Francisco Public Library

Government Information Center
San Francisco Public Library
100 Larkin Street 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

REFERENCE BOOK
Not to be taken from the Library

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/minutes2011sanf_0

3 1223 09321 1309

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

GAVIN NEWSOM
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

JAN - 5 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

83.71
1
1/10/11

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING AND AGENDA
MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 2011, 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL, ROOM 421
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS
Public comment will be taken before the Committee takes action on any item.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.**
2. **Approval of Minutes of the December 13, 2010 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: December 13, 2010 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)
3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
4. **Draft Strategic Plans Presentation and Commissioner Feedback on Department Program Areas.** Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter and Commissioner Johanna Wald (Explanatory Documents: Draft Strategic Plans) (Informational Presentations and Discussion)
   A. **Zero Waste.** Staff Presenter: Robert Haley, Zero Waste Program Manager (10 minutes)
   B. **Urban Forestry and Urban Agriculture.** Staff Presenter: Mei Ling Hui, Urban Forestry Council Coordinator (10 minutes)
5. **Agenda Process for Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meetings.** (Discussion) Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald
6. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)
7. **Announcements.** (Discussion)
8. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)
9. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
10. **Adjournment.**

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary, Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, February 14, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee , or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org within three business days of a meeting. If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Commission Policy Committee after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Department of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 during normal office hours or will be made available at the Policy Committee meeting website link https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee as attachments included with the agenda or meeting minutes.

Important Information

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the Committee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Committee members. Any written comments should be sent to: Commission Secretary of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Comments which cannot be delivered to the Commission Secretary by that time may be taken directly to the hearing at the location above. When bringing handouts to meetings, please photocopy on both sides of the paper and try to use post-consumer recycled or tree-free paper. Also, please bring sufficient copies of handouts for the Committee, the Commission Secretary and the public.

Public Comment

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but are not on today's agenda. Public comment will be taken following each agendized item. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes, unless otherwise announced by the Chair. If it is demonstrated that the comments by the public will exceed 15 minutes, the Chair may continue Public Comment to another time during the meeting.

The Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue not appearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In response to public comment, not on an agendized item, the Committee is limited to:

1. Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
2. Request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
3. Directing staff to place the item or issue on a future agenda (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Disability Access

The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meeting will be held at City Hall, Room 421, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, in the Civic Center area. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the Civic Center Station at United Nations Plaza and Market Street. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro Stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For information about MUNI accessible services call (415) 923-6142. There is accessible curbside parking adjacent to City Hall on Grove Street and Van Ness Avenue and in the vicinity of the Veterans Building at 401 Van Ness Avenue adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Monica Fish at (415) 355-3709 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call the Mayor's Office on Disability at (415) 554-6789 or (415) 554-6799 (TTY) for further information.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance
(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Sunshine Task Force Administrator, City Hall, Room 409, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683 at Phone No.: (415) 554-7724; Fax No.: (415) 554-7854; E-mail: sotf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3112; web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Posted: January 4, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

F
83.71
#2
1/10/11
draft

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

JAN 21 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 2011, 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL, ROOM 421
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:03 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald, Gravanis and Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the December 13, 2010 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Documents: December 13, 2010 Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Prakash, the December 13, 2010 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Commissioners Wald, Gravanis and Prakash)

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

Item 5 was heard before Item 4.

4. **Draft Strategic Plans Presentation and Commissioner Feedback on Department Program Areas.** Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter and Commissioner Johanna Wald (Explanatory Documents: Draft Strategic Plans) (Informational Presentations and Discussion)

   A. **Zero Waste.** Staff Presenter: Robert Haley, Zero Waste Program Manager

   Director Nutter reported that at the past two Policy Committee meetings, Department staff presented on Draft Strategic Plans for the Energy, Climate, Toxics Reduction, Green Building, Environmental Justice and Environment Now programs for Commissioner-input and feedback. Today's meeting will include presentations on Zero Waste, Urban Forestry and Urban Agriculture. Public Outreach, Clean Transportation and the Director's Draft Plans will be presented to the Policy Committee at their February 14 meeting. The full Commission will review the final version of the Draft Strategic Plan at their March 22 meeting after Policy Committee review of the individual program area plans

Mr. Haley reported that San Francisco has achieved 77% landfill diversion in 2008, exceeding its goal of 75% by 2010. He stated that disposal is decreasing every year and decreased 15% in the most recent year. There are still approximately half a million tons to eliminate from landfills each year before reaching zero waste. The economy appears to be starting to improve which could make zero waste more challenging. About 35% of what is sent to landfill is compostable (mostly food), and 30% is recyclable (mostly construction and demolition debris, and paper). There is good potential to capture this material through current programs and policies. If all of this material can be captured, San Francisco would be at about 90% diversion, close to zero waste. The key is to influence everybody to participate in diverting all material through consumer responsibility. San Francisco's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance and Construction and Demolition Debris Ordinance are key laws for this effort.

Mr. Haley discussed consumer responsibility challenges that are faced such as building structures. Some buildings have only one refuse chute. It is known that 100% participation will not be reached, so there is a need to find new ways to separate material through researching and developing low-temperature, mechanical/biological, mixed-material recovery processes. He explained that the remaining disposal that presents problems consists mostly of composite items and other materials listed in Strategic Plan Zero Waste Draft fourth paragraph. Programs can be created but, in order to be successful, would require a source of funding and involvement of manufacturers and retailers. Ultimately, there is a need for policies that addresses producer responsibility to change the way things are made to help with recovery and achieve zero waste.

Mr. Haley discussed goals, objectives and actions (see Zero Waste Strategic Plan Draft):

- Goal 1: Decrease disposal 9% (above 44,000 tons) annually to achieve zero waste by 2020 and protect ecosystems, conserve resources and energy, and reduce pollution and climate change.
- Goal 2: Advance towards zero waste by holding producers and consumers responsible for their waste.
- Goal 3: Assist with landfill agreement, refuse rate and other processes.

Commissioner Gravanis provided suggestions that include:

- Highlight reducing unnecessary consumption in the Strategic Plan narrative as a primary goal. Identify resources or fundraise for a public education campaign on reducing unnecessary consumption. Director Nutter reported that the Outreach team is researching interesting campaigns that other cities have done on this topic and will be discussing how to integrate this action into the Plan.
- On Objective B, Action 7, to promote waste prevention through double-sided printing and copying and food redistribution. The issue is really about resource conservation. While promoting waste prevention helps keep waste out of the landfill, it is more about resource conservation (not buying what you don't need).
- Redemption. Currently state law requires that people are able to redeem their beverage containers for cash and that there be adequate locations to do so. Ensure that there are enough places to bring things for redemption and also to allow for better source separation, thus creating a higher market value for recyclables.
- Ensure that recyclables are more marketable as one of the Strategic Plan goals. Improve labeling of compostable products so plastics are not contaminated by biodegradable products. Better source separation is a key element that would increase the marketability of recyclables and should be part of the overall policies even though metrics are not yet available. Mr. Haley cited Action 6 "work with Recology to restore Fantastic 3 recycling residuals below 10%." Commissioner Gravanis suggested elaborating that the policy should include that we want to sell our recyclables for top dollar.

- Provide education and outreach to individual homeowners about acquiring building materials and places to transport them, such as Building Resources.

Commissioner Prakash cited legislation that is being done nationally on electronic waste and inquired whether other cities, states and countries are working on similar types of legislation for reducing composite items. Mr. Haley stated that San Francisco is at the forefront on most programs; e.g., the Food Service Waste Reduction Ordinance banning Styrofoam and Plastic Bag Reduction Ordinance banning plastic checkout bags at supermarkets and chain drugstores. He explained that not much is happening on asphalt roofing or textiles other than a good reuse network in San Francisco for textiles. The Zero Waste team is researching Washington State's program to remove lead paint from the outside of wood and reuse the wood, but there are toxics issues. There are also interesting new diaper composting programs. A state bill was passed on carpets, but got weakened to the point of being almost useless. Commissioner Gravanis stated that a group had applied for a grant from the Department of the Environment for composting pet by-products. Mr. Haley stated that reducing and recovering composite items can be tricky.

Commissioner Wald provided the following comments:

- Discussed the importance of communicating to all of San Francisco what the Department of the Environment is accomplishing through these efforts and not overlook the educational value of these plans to everyone in the community.
- Inquired whether penalties are issued for non-compliance of laws. Mr. Haley explained that Ms. Williams of the Zero Waste team has registered over 300 construction and demolition debris transporters, and there are about a dozen registered facilities, so there are many options and no reason to take it to the wrong place. She is at construction sites on almost a daily basis to enforce the law, but has not had the need to fine anyone or revoke a registration. Simply passing a law has had a huge impact and there hasn't been a need yet for strict enforcement. Getting the word out that it is the law oftentimes solves the problem. There was a need to enforce the foodware ordinance with over 100 restaurants, and we're actively educating and assisting people with the Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance.
- Suggested extending the Virtual Warehouse beyond City facilities to neighborhood programs so that more products can be reused and recycled citywide. Mr. Haley stated that there was originally a grant-funded group called Magic that matched products online and then acquired a warehouse and trucks, but the service could not be maintained. He explained that foundations are not interested in funding this type of service. The Department then funded a group called Excess Access that is still active. Some of the material from the Virtual Warehouse goes to Excess Access if City departments do not want it. There are other groups in the private sector providing a similar service; e.g., Craigslist, iReuse, Freecycle. He explained that the Department's website mentions these services, but that more outreach is needed to communicate to the community that these services are available. Commissioner Wald suggested an education campaign around this issue.
- Suggested developing green programs for other jurisdictions that would provide revenue for the Department. Mr. Haley stated that it is possible to do so, but noted the difference in programs, structure and size of San Francisco in comparison to other locations.
- Suggested a campaign with other cities, jurisdictions, communities and NGO's for producer responsibility. Develop a process and rationale for picking one or two products and identify a revenue stream. Mr. Haley suggested that a discussion be held at the Policy Committee about toxic and problem products for zero waste. Commissioner Wald suggested identifying a way to reduce people's costs if they take some items out of the waste stream. Mr. Haley stated that it would be an interesting discussion about changing the way products are made, funding government costs to deal with problem products and producer take-back of products.

Public Comment

Mr. Jim Rhoads, Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC) stated that HANC has been operating the recycling center next to Kesar Stadium for 35 years. He complimented the Department's Zero Waste plan. Mr. Rhoads reported that HANC has worked on a lot of the activities citied in the Strategic Plan for the past couple of decades and asked that it include more of a discussion about the need to expand the availability of recycling centers in San Francisco. He stated that HANC does source separation of recyclables that helps the waste diversion policies in San Francisco, and people are educated on source separation just by coming to the recycling center. Mr. Rhoads reported that HANC has been served an eviction notice by the Recreation and Park Department, and that Supervisor Mirkarimi would be calling for a hearing on recycling in San Francisco that the Department may be part of. He explained that HANC has had a lot of support to continue their work which includes involvement with the urban agriculture movement, being the fiscal agent for Garden for the Environment, raising thousands of native plants, and holding classes on composting. He stated that the organization is a viable part of what is going on in San Francisco and would like to be a bigger part of the Strategic Plan.

Mr. David Pilpel provided the following suggestions:

- The preamble or bullet points do not address highest and best use. More should be done to retrieve products from the waste stream that are still usable and can be reused.
- Elaborate on what references to "11-13" means because it is not cited in the document title. Director Nutter explained that 11-13 references fiscal years 2011 to 2013.
- Provide more detail for each bullet point about how plans are to be carried out. Provide regular reports to the Commission on progress, success, and obstacles for each of these points.
- Add Extended Producer Responsibility for packaging as a goal with staff allocation. Determine whether Toxics, Zero Waste, Public Outreach or a combination of all programs should share in this goal and how.
- The Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance has helped considerably. It is important to screen facilities and truck loads as early as possible to separate any wrong material. Recology has funding to provide this service and should provide additional staffing for this effort.
- Mr. Rhoads talked about the importance of HANC. Expand the reference in the Strategic Plan to other non-profits and their importance to the waste system.
- Accomplish more reuse through the Public Recycling and Disposal Area (PRDA). There is an opportunity for non-profits to participate more in this area.
- Reinforce meaningful public and stakeholder participation to avoid the uncertainty of the rate process for all parties.
- There is a composting council conference at the end of the month that staff is participating in and would be an interesting report for the Commission at the next meeting.

Mr. Jake Grumbach suggested that the Zero Waste team consult and/or partner with the Department of Public Health, the East Bay Alliance for Climate Education, Southeast Food Alliance, and PG&E on their successful outreach programs. He stated that the Department of Public Health has workgroups and a good framework for partnering with non-profits, stakeholders, and other community groups to add waste prevention and composting in school curricula. He suggested that young people be sent to schools that only do paper recycling to teach composting. Mr. Haley pointed out that the Department has a School Education program that is doing such things.

B. Urban Forestry and Urban Agriculture. Staff Presenter: Mei Ling Hui, Urban Forestry Council Coordinator

Director Nutter discussed the Department's desire for the Urban Forestry and Urban Agriculture programs to grow and flourish. She explained that Ms. Hui is the sole staff assigned to work on both of

these programs. This is the first Urban Agriculture Strategic Plan that the Commissioners will be reviewing. It is the first step in segregating the plan away from the Environmental Justice program into its own program.

Urban Forestry Program

Ms. Hui reported that the Street Tree Action Plan sets forth a goal for tree planting by doubling the number of street trees from the 2004 level by planting an additional 5000 trees per year for 20 years. She discussed San Francisco's specific climate and infrastructure limitations that may restrict the possibility of reaching canopy coverage similar to the national average of about 27%. The most recent study suggests that San Francisco has approximately 12% canopy. (Urban Forest Program Strategic Plan Draft narrative paragraphs 2 and 3.) She explained that a bigger issue affecting the urban forest is a continual loss of trees due to benign neglect or illegal removal because of construction. It is hard to monitor those two causes. The Department of Public Works and the Recreation and Park Department consistently report that they do not have enough staff to provide the level of care that their trees require. She is working with the Urban Forestry Council to review existing policies around construction and how a tree is noted for protection status.

Ms. Hui reported that the Urban Forest Program has one goal to promote a healthy and sustainable urban forest. Objectives and actions set forth to achieve that goal is outlined in the Urban Forest Program Strategic Plan Draft. Objectives include (a) implementing the Urban Forestry Council Ordinance; (b) promoting education and outreach programs and providing information on city tree management and related activities; and (c) developing innovative long-term funding strategies for urban forestry programs. This goal includes increasing the size of the urban forest and providing better maintenance for trees. The majority of programmatic activities are to support the Urban Forestry Council, the advisory body to the Mayor, Board of Supervisors and City departments on policy and programmatic issues that will improve the health of the urban forest. Ms. Hui stated that the most important objective is to identify ways to improve funding streams that can be applied to tree planting and tree care.

Director Nutter discussed differences between the City's tree planting goals and those of the Department's. As with some of the other Department programs, City and Department goals may be the same or not based on available resources to implement the goal. In this case, the Department acknowledges the City goal and wants to help that City goal, but has not adopted it due to a lack of resources. The Department is leading the effort for the Urban Forest Program on the goal of planting 100,000 new street trees in 20 years and ensuring funding for maintenance. Ms. Hui stated that the Urban Forestry Council commissioned the Street Tree Action Plan so that planting 100,000 new street trees would not only be a City goal, but adopted internally and citywide.

Commissioner Gravanis provided the following comments:

- Provide a definition of what the urban forest is.
- Elaborate how the 100,000 street trees translate into trees per lot or mile. The goals for street tree planting are excellent.
- Second paragraph of the narrative: do not compare San Francisco's total canopy to those of cities that have been previously occupied by tree-dominated landscapes. There should be an understanding that San Francisco's climate is different from those cities that a comparison is being made to. The fact that we only have a 12% total canopy should not be troubling and may be the right amount for this location. Biodiversity expertise and goals should guide the overall tree planting goal. Do not refer to San Francisco's climate restrictions. Our climate should be guiding our decisions of how many trees we plant and where we plant them. It should not be regarded as a restriction on what humans want to do and impose on our natural heritage. Include a discussion of tree planting to make that distinction. Tree planting can be just as harmful to biodiversity as it is

helpful if the wrong tree is selected for the wrong location. The Department of the Environment does not have the resources to state meaningful goals for our overall canopy.

- Avoid duplication of tree planting efforts between the Department and Friends of the Urban Forest so there is a clear sense of what the Department's value is to this effort.
- San Francisco Arbor Day should be held in the fall not the spring.
- Focus more on outreach events; e.g., more maintenance workshops and tree tours.
- Developing long-term funding strategies is an excellent objective.
- Do not devote additional time to the benefits of trees to climate change. An increasing number of studies show that planting trees in temperate climates do not help global warming. Studies also show that other kinds of vegetation such as grasslands sequester carbon as well as trees do.
- Explore the cost-effectiveness of having street tree maintenance done by private homeowners compared with having homeowners pay a fee for City government to provide this service.

Ms. Hui stated that even though San Francisco's climate is different than New York's, a comparison is being made because New York is a city with buildings, streets, and people that is thought of as being super-urban. Since San Francisco wants to increase its canopy, this comparison helps people understand why our goals are so important. Commissioner Gravanis stated that would be acceptable for street trees and encouraged competing with New York City for the number of street trees per mile, but it should not sound as if it is wrong for San Francisco not to have the same coverage for the total city. It makes people think that we need to go out and plant in open spaces and natural areas, which could be detrimental to our goal of biodiversity. She suggested that it be stated in a way so as to protect our indigenous ecosystems.

Ms. Hui stated that in comparing the work of the Department with Friends of the Urban Forest, the Department's goals are more focused on policy than hands-on work. She explained there are upcoming programs where there may be an overlap (Urban Orchards) where there will be programming partnerships with other City departments and agencies. The same problem is being worked on in different areas. Ms. Hui reported that she does hold one maintenance workshop a year for City employees that work on trees which is a requirement of the Ordinance that created the Urban Forestry Council. For the most part, holding workshops is more of a Friends of the Urban Forest activity. There may be ways to partner with them through an outreach program to highlight the maintenance programs that they do or to influence people to attend tree tours.

Commissioner Prakash inquired if the resource constraints are with project development or implementation. He asked who manages the volunteers and would be planting the 5000 trees per year for 20 years that the Street Tree Action Plan calls for. Ms. Hui stated that the Street Tree Action Plan was a report based off of a study of how many street trees San Francisco has and how many spaces are available for new street trees. The result was that there was room for 100,000 new street trees. The Department of Public Works, Friends of the Urban Forest and the Recreation and Park Department does the tree planting in the city.

Commissioner Prakash suggested partnering with young organizations that do volunteer work, e.g., City Year. Ms. Hui reported that Friends of the Urban Forest has a youth training program that was funded recently through the Department of the Environment. The Recreation and Park Department has an active volunteer program, and they invite other groups and volunteer-connector organizations to work with them mostly on planting, not maintenance. Friends of the Urban Forest provides the best opportunities on learning how to maintain trees. The Department of Public Works also has many volunteer opportunities, e.g., a street clean team program that is held once a month, and there is always greening and other maintenance projects.

Commissioner Wald asked if the Urban Forest Program Strategic Plan document would be used as a way to prioritize future Department work and fundraising priorities. Director Nutter stated that it has been brought to her attention that the Urban Forest Program is one of the plans that high goals have been set

for, but does not have the resources to ensure that goals will be met department or citywide. Most of the other strategic plans are either fully funded or close to fully funded including the stretch goals. This is a document that demonstrated the stark difference in what we have and where we need to get. It won't require taking resources from other programs, but additional opportunities will be sought after to fund this program. She discussed the most recent funding opportunity through Eco Media to pull together all city tree planting efforts among city agencies. The Urban Forest Program is one area that she and the Grants Manager are seeking new opportunities through grant or foundation funding. Director Nutter explained that the City does not currently have a Greening Director, and other agencies have resource constraints for tree maintenance. Ms. Hui stated that she is looking for funding so that the Department can expand its program and for other agencies to do the actual hands-on work.

Commissioner Wald stated that she approves of connecting the urban forestry program to the climate program because it does provide a contribution to address climate. She suggested adding a discussion in the preamble about the contribution that street trees could make to the climate in lieu of the comparison with other cities' canopy coverage. There should be a statement as to why trees are valuable in cities and the contribution that they bring. Commissioner Gravanis suggested adding more about the contribution trees make to storm water management. Commissioner Wald stated that she does not want trees in natural areas, but doesn't want people to think that trees would be cut down in grasslands.

Ms. Hui reported that the Recreation and Park Department is working on the Recreation and Open Space Element that may address a lot of questions concerning land use planning and the natural areas program. The most recent funding from the Clean and Safe Neighborhoods Park Bond will provide the Recreation and Park Department with an opportunity to include tree maintenance. It is a capital improvement project. They are doing a lot of work categorizing their trees and the care they need as well as natural areas. When that is complete, that will provide the information that Commissioner Gravanis wants to have included. The information may not be included in the final Strategic Plan publication in March, but will be kept on the radar for the future year.

Public Comment: Mr. Nick Kline asked if because of resource restrictions there was attention to selection of certain species that require less care than others. Ms. Hui confirmed that trees that do best in this environment are being selected first. Acquiring the biggest healthiest tree with the least amount of input is also important as well as making sure that we are not planting too large of a percentage of one species. There is experimentation going on and some trees are being phased out because of some environmental concerns and disease. Commissioner Gravanis stated that some trees are also breaking sidewalks. Mr. Kline stated that Commissioner Gravanis had mentioned other benefits of having trees in an urban environment. Do urban trees help urban heat elements? Ms. Hui confirmed that they do. People think of it more as trees increasing the temperature within a city to reduce building energy loads. In San Francisco, a tree may actually increase building energy loads in some cases. We do have an urban heat element that affects outlying areas more than energy usage in the urban city. It is less of an issue for us than in areas such as Sacramento.

Urban Agriculture Program

Ms. Hui discussed her background in ecological agriculture that fits in with the key role she has been assigned in working on the Mayor's 2009 Directive on Healthy and Sustainable Foods Policy. There has been a movement building in urban agriculture by the Urban Agriculture Alliance and other community advisory groups such as the Mayor's Food Security Task Force. Ms. Hui has been working with these groups to help direct that movement so it has a clear direction. (See Urban Agriculture Strategic Plan Draft narrative.)

Ms. Hui reported that the Urban Agriculture program has one goal to "increase food production and opportunities for urban gardening in San Francisco." She reported on actions to be worked on for objectives that include (a) supporting policy initiatives; (b) building capacity of existing City programs; and

(c) supporting community organization and public education and information campaigns. (See Urban Agriculture Strategic Plan Goals, Objectives, and Actions.)

Ms. Hui stated that she is supporting the Planning Department and Mayor's Office efforts to create an urban agriculture zoning designation. University of San Francisco interns will be conducting an existing resource and resource gaps assessment to establish the baseline of current activities and opportunities for improvement. In addition, the Planning Department will be creating a map showing existing opportunities for urban gardening in San Francisco. One issue that is not currently being addressed in the City is commercial agriculture. There are several groups that produce food, but no one is succeeding yet. Presidio School of Management is assisting with a study to assess barriers facing production-focused models. A study will be conducted on common environmental toxins that may affect produce quality common in San Francisco. Ms. Hui elaborated on Objectives B to build capacity of existing City programs and C to support community organization and public education and information campaigns as outlined in the Strategic Plan Draft.

Commissioner Wald provided a funding referral for the Urban Agriculture program. Commissioner Gravanis stated that she is impressed with the program and it is something that San Francisco has needed for a long time. Community gardens did not have a home for a while, and it is nice to see it is moving forward. She suggested that the Strategic Plan Draft include narrative on how this program would relate to and provide benefits to the environment so that it can be justified as a Department of the Environment program, e.g., reducing the carbon footprint from transportation of food from other areas, controlling the use of toxic pesticide may be easier with local food. Ms. Hui stated that this program is very much like the Urban Forest Program in that it is uniquely positioned to collaborate, direct policy and programming ideas with all agencies that might be involved with urban agriculture in the City so everyone is supporting one another.

Commissioner Prakash inquired why there is such a high failure rate for commercial agriculture in the city and if the studies would help prove the reasons why. He asked if there are other cities that are leaders in urban farming that could be consulted for ideas. Ms. Hui explained that San Francisco has a long history of farming. When there was more open space, there were cows in Cow Hollow. Cuba, which is a highly urbanized area, is very successful at urban farming. San Francisco does have different climate conditions than other cities and different opportunities because of how our buildings are structured. New York puts a lot of emphasis on rooftop gardens. San Francisco does not have a freezing climate so buildings do not have a snow-load and can't actually hold the weight of a garden. We are trying to identify ways to approach and find land and resources to promote urban agriculture. San Francisco's situation is unique, and we have specific issues to deal with. Commissioner Prakash asked if there is another city that is comparable to San Francisco that has had a metric of success. Ms. Hui stated that she is looking into Seattle, Portland and some cities in Canada for comparisons and what can be adjusted to fit for us. Business plans and land access issues may be reasons that commercial agriculture was not successful in the past. Director Nutter explained that this is another program that San Francisco can lead the way and make an impact on. Foundations are looking to San Francisco to provide their expertise. Ms. Hui explained that the urban agriculture model is meant to grow and produce food that will reduce the carbon impact of our local food chain and increase urban sustainability and resiliency.

Commissioner Wald stated that this program should be connected with the Environmental Justice program so that there is an emphasis on serving underserved neighborhoods. Ms. Hui stated that she is working with the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project, a longtime advocate for urban farm installations. The Treasure Island Redevelopment Plan is also looking at insuring that urban farms are maintained. She confirmed that the environmental justice connection would be made.

Public Comment: Mr. Jake Grumbach discussed a complaint that he heard from the Urban Agriculture Alliance about permitting/zoning barriers for someone who wanted to start their own urban garden on an unused private lot. Ms. Hui reported that there will be a code designation introduced for farms in the city

to allow for sale of produce. If you are going to grow produce for yourself, you can do whatever you want on your land. If you want to sell what you produce, there is a question about this type of business in residential areas. A farm does not qualify as a home office. Little City Gardens is an example of an empty lot in a residential area which is being addressed.

Mr. Grumbach discussed Department of Public Health urban agriculture initiatives in the environmental justice arena especially in southeast part of the city. He suggested that the Department identify an environmental angle and not a health angle and create a distribution model similar to Project Open Hand. Ms. Hui stated that she works with the Health Department on these and other Department programs.

5. **Agenda Process for Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meetings.** (Discussion) Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald

Commissioner Wald asked Commissioners to provide their suggestions for an organizing principle for agenda setting in order to maximize efficiency of Commissioner-time and effectiveness of the Commission role. She reported that agenda setting was previously driven by the Urban Environmental Accords and now by a running list (Future Agenda Items Checklist) of agenda items and ideas that the Commission Secretary keeps track of. The New Business/Future Agenda Items topic on each agenda has been used effectively to set agendas for future meetings. In addition, the Committee Chair, Director and Commission Secretary meet before each meeting to set the agenda for the next meeting through the topics listed on the checklist and Commissioner ideas.

Commissioner Prakash stated that he would send agenda ideas to the Committee Chair. He suggested creating an online secure depository for agenda suggestions that Commissioners/ designated staff could access that would serve as a one-way communication path. Commissioners and/or the Commission Secretary could monitor the site for agenda suggestions. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that Department staff keep Commissioners apprised of issues that should be addressed in addition to items that are legally required such as the Reduced Risk Pesticide List, the Strategic Plan, etc. She asked that a review be made of each item that is proposed to determine the most effective way to deal with that issue, e.g., which Committee should the issue go to, should it go to the Committee first or full Commission only, could the item be presented as a written report.

6. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

Director Nutter provided an update on legislation and policy as follows:

- The Drug Disposal Ordinance that was moving through the Board of Supervisors last year was postponed by Supervisor Mirkarimi. A new Board and Mayor will be looking at that Ordinance, but it has not yet been scheduled. The Ordinance would mandate that drug manufacturers identify an industry-led disposal program to remove pharmaceuticals out of our water and landfills.

- The Commercial Building Ordinance which basically mandates that any commercial buildings in San Francisco over 10,000 square feet are required to have benchmarking of their energy use as well as an energy audit within three years was postponed. It is currently at the Land Use Committee.

- The California Energy Commission approved updates to the Green Building Code and Commercial Lighting Ordinance that combined all requirements of CalGreen with stricter local requirements that became effective January 1, 2011. The Green Building Team spent a lot of time making sure that CalGreen included San Francisco standards, and that there wasn't going to be any conflict moving forward. That was a huge victory on the policy side.

- The annual holiday tree reuse media event with Recology and Recreation and Park Department was held at City Hall. Kevin Drew of the Zero Waste team was the spokesperson and got a lot of media coverage about how your holiday tree can be reused.

- A $250,000 grant was received from the Frank Foundation to plan for how San Francisco can be renewable by 2020. A series of meetings will be held with the Public Utilities Commission and the Power Plant Task Force who have done a lot of work on the Electricity Resource Plan to insure that efforts are not duplicated and to review past work on how to be more energy-efficient and find renewable sources of power for San Francisco. A new Program Manager will be hired to oversee that program. The deliverable will be an actual plan on how to accomplish this effort within that timeframe.

- An Electric Vehicle Regional Task Force is forming through an initiative of our Department, the Bay Area Climate Collaborative and a number of other entities that are pulling together electric vehicle thought leaders regionally to think through what the infrastructure will look like, where resources will come from and how electric vehicles will become a reality. The focus will be on transit first, but we want to make sure that we make the best use of our investment. This is the time to make policy decisions for the city and regionally.

- It is budget season and a series of meetings will be held. The Commission will be seeing a draft budget at the January meeting.

- The Policy Committee will be reviewing Strategic Plan Drafts in February for Clean Transportation, Public Outreach and School Education, and the Director's Report. The full Commission will hear a presentation on the full Strategic Plan for final comments and approval at their March meeting.

- Commissioner Martin has resigned from the Commission, and Mayor Newsom has appointed a new Commissioner, Jason Elliott, on January 6, 2011.

Commissioner Gravanis asked for a future report on America's Cup and what the Department of the Environment and Commission can do to assist in making this event environmentally sustainable.

7. **Announcements.** (Discussion)

Commissioner Gravanis announced that there is a Global Tap station at the UC Parnassus Student Union. Commissioner Wald announced that there are also stations at the United Concourse and Yerba Buena Park, and that there would be a hard roll out of stations the week of January 20. Ms. Knowles reported that she has heard that another station will be located at Crissy Field or the San Francisco Birding Area. Commissioner Gravanis encouraged everyone not to focus on the particular brand of station, but on the overall goal of getting people to refill their bottles through various ways.

Director Nutter announced that the Department is holding an Arts Open House this Thursday from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. The Green Business Awards will be held on January 19 at the Green Room, War Memorial, from 6:00 – 9:00 p.m. There will be 40 – 50 awards given out for businesses that have reached their green business certification.

8. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)

   Commissioner Wald reported that the February 14 meeting will include continuation of a review of Program Area Strategic Plan drafts and the Director's Draft Plan and a status report on the Literacy for Environmental Justice Herons Head Eco Center.

   Ms. Knowles proposed creating a reward for Supervisor Emeritus Sophie Maxwell for her work assisting the environmental community and the Asthma Task Force by influencing the Housing Authority to conduct a pilot Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program at the Sunnydale housing units. The ultimate goal is to create a policy in San Francisco for the Housing Authority to practice IPM because it is not a requirement. A discussion was held on ways that the Commission could present such an award to Commissioner Emeritus Maxwell to let her know her effort is appreciated. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that the Commission consider a commendation Resolution. The idea of the Department or Commission issuing Environmental Pioneer Awards was discussed. Commissioner Wald suggested that the Policy Committee hold a more extensive discussion on establishing an annual Environmental Pioneer award process. She suggested that the Commission do a commendation Resolution and that Mark Leno request a Resolution from the legislature commending her for this effort.

9. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

10. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary, Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, February 14, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. n Room 421, City Hall.

Approved:

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 2011, 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL, ROOM 421
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

FEB 15 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

3.71
-
0/11
proved

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:03 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald, Gravanis and Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the December 13, 2010 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Documents: December 13, 2010 Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Prakash, the December 13, 2010 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Commissioners Wald, Gravanis and Prakash)

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

Item 5 was heard before Item 4.

4. **Draft Strategic Plans Presentation and Commissioner Feedback on Department Program Areas.** Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter and Commissioner Johanna Wald (Explanatory Documents: Draft Strategic Plans) (Informational Presentations and Discussion)

   A. Zero Waste. Staff Presenter: Robert Haley, Zero Waste Program Manager

   Director Nutter reported that at the past two Policy Committee meetings, Department staff presented on Draft Strategic Plans for the Energy, Climate, Toxics Reduction, Green Building, Environmental Justice, and Environment Now programs for Commissioner-input and feedback. Today's meeting will include presentations on Zero Waste, Urban Forestry and Urban Agriculture. Public Outreach, Clean Transportation and the Director's Draft Plans will be presented to the Policy Committee at their February 14 meeting. The full Commission will review the final version of the Draft Strategic Plan at their March 22 meeting after Policy Committee review of the individual program area plans.

Mr. Haley reported that San Francisco has achieved 77% landfill diversion in 2008, exceeding its goal of 75% by 2010. He stated that disposal is decreasing every year and decreased 15% in the most recent year. There are still approximately half a million tons to eliminate from landfills each year before reaching zero waste. The economy appears to be starting to improve which could make zero waste more challenging. About 35% of what is sent to landfill is compostable (mostly food), and 30% is recyclable (mostly construction and demolition debris, and paper). There is good potential to capture this material through current programs and policies. If all of this material can be captured, San Francisco would be at about 90% diversion, close to zero waste. The key is to influence everybody to participate in diverting all material through consumer responsibility. San Francisco's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance and Construction and Demolition Debris Ordinance are key laws for this effort.

Mr. Haley discussed consumer responsibility challenges that are faced such as building structures. Some buildings have only one refuse chute. It is known that 100% participation will not be reached, so there is a need to find new ways to separate material through researching and developing low-temperature, mechanical/biological, mixed-material recovery processes. He explained that the remaining disposal that presents problems consists mostly of composite items and other materials listed in Strategic Plan Zero Waste Draft fourth paragraph. Programs can be created but, in order to be successful, would require a source of funding and involvement of manufacturers and retailers. Ultimately, there is a need for policies that addresses producer responsibility to change the way things are made to help with recovery and achieve zero waste.

Mr. Haley discussed goals, objectives and actions (see Zero Waste Strategic Plan Draft):

- Goal 1: Decrease disposal 9% (above 44,000 tons) annually to achieve zero waste by 2020 and protect ecosystems, conserve resources and energy, and reduce pollution and climate change.
- Goal 2: Advance towards zero waste by holding producers and consumers responsible for their waste.
- Goal 3: Assist with landfill agreement, refuse rate and other processes.

Commissioner Gravanis provided suggestions that include:

- Highlight reducing unnecessary consumption in the Strategic Plan narrative as a primary goal. Identify resources or fundraise for a public education campaign on reducing unnecessary consumption. Director Nutter reported that the Outreach team is researching interesting campaigns that other cities have done on this topic and will be discussing how to integrate this action into the Plan.
- On Objective B, Action 7, to promote waste prevention through double-sided printing and copying and food redistribution. The issue is really about resource conservation. While promoting waste prevention helps keep waste out of the landfill, it is more about resource conservation (not buying what you don't need).
- Redemption. Currently state law requires that people are able to redeem their beverage containers for cash and that there be adequate locations to do so. Ensure that there are enough places to bring things for redemption and also to allow for better source separation, thus creating a higher market value for recyclables.
- Ensure that recyclables are more marketable as one of the Strategic Plan goals. Improve labeling of compostable products so plastics are not contaminated by biodegradable products. Better source separation is a key element that would increase the marketability of recyclables and should be part of the overall policies even though metrics are not yet available. Mr. Haley cited Action 6 "work with Recology to restore Fantastic 3 recycling residuals below 10%." Commissioner Gravanis suggested elaborating that the policy should include that we want to sell our recyclables for top dollar.

- Provide education and outreach to individual homeowners about acquiring building materials and places to transport them, such as Building Resources.

Commissioner Prakash cited legislation that is being done nationally on electronic waste and inquired whether other cities, states and countries are working on similar types of legislation for reducing composite items. Mr. Haley stated that San Francisco is at the forefront on most programs; e.g., the Food Service Waste Reduction Ordinance banning Styrofoam and Plastic Bag Reduction Ordinance banning plastic checkout bags at supermarkets and chain drugstores. He explained that not much is happening on asphalt roofing or textiles other than a good reuse network in San Francisco for textiles. The Zero Waste team is researching Washington State's program to remove lead paint from the outside of wood and reuse the wood, but there are toxics issues. There are also interesting new diaper composting programs. A state bill was passed on carpets, but got weakened to the point of being almost useless. Commissioner Gravanis stated that a group had applied for a grant from the Department of the Environment for composting pet by-products. Mr. Haley stated that reducing and recovering composite items can be tricky.

Commissioner Wald provided the following comments:

- Discussed the importance of communicating to all of San Francisco what the Department of the Environment is accomplishing through these efforts and not overlook the educational value of these plans to everyone in the community.
- Inquired whether penalties are issued for non-compliance of laws. Mr. Haley explained that Ms. Williams of the Zero Waste team has registered over 300 construction and demolition debris transporters, and there are about a dozen registered facilities, so there are many options and no reason to take it to the wrong place. She is at construction sites on almost a daily basis to enforce the law, but has not had the need to fine anyone or revoke a registration. Simply passing a law has had a huge impact and there hasn't been a need yet for strict enforcement. Getting the word out that it is the law oftentimes solves the problem. There was a need to enforce the foodware ordinance with over 100 restaurants, and we're actively educating and assisting people with the Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance.
- Suggested extending the Virtual Warehouse beyond City facilities to neighborhood programs so that more products can be reused and recycled citywide. Mr. Haley stated that there was originally a grant-funded group called Magic that matched products online and then acquired a warehouse and trucks, but the service could not be maintained. He explained that foundations are not interested in funding this type of service. The Department then funded a group called Excess Access that is still active. Some of the material from the Virtual Warehouse goes to Excess Access if City departments do not want it. There are other groups in the private sector providing a similar service; e.g., Craigslist, iReuse, Freecycle. He explained that the Department's website mentions these services, but that more outreach is needed to communicate to the community that these services are available. Commissioner Wald suggested an education campaign around this issue.
- Suggested developing green programs for other jurisdictions that would provide revenue for the Department. Mr. Haley stated that it is possible to do so, but noted the difference in programs, structure and size of San Francisco in comparison to other locations.
- Suggested a campaign with other cities, jurisdictions, communities and NGO's for producer responsibility. Develop a process and rationale for picking one or two products and identify a revenue stream. Mr. Haley suggested that a discussion be held at the Policy Committee about toxic and problem products for zero waste. Commissioner Wald suggested identifying a way to reduce people's costs if they take some items out of the waste stream. Mr. Haley stated that it would be an interesting discussion about changing the way products are made, funding government costs to deal with problem products and producer take-back of products.

Public Comment

Mr. Jim Rhoads, Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC) stated that HANC has been operating the recycling center next to Kesar Stadium for 35 years. He complimented the Department's Zero Waste plan. Mr. Rhoads reported that HANC has worked on a lot of the activities citied in the Strategic Plan for the past couple of decades and asked that it include more of a discussion about the need to expand the availability of recycling centers in San Francisco. He stated that HANC does source separation of recyclables that helps the waste diversion policies in San Francisco, and people are educated on source separation just by coming to the recycling center. Mr. Rhoads reported that HANC has been served an eviction notice by the Recreation and Park Department, and that Supervisor Mirkarimi would be calling for a hearing on recycling in San Francisco that the Department may be part of. He explained that HANC has had a lot of support to continue their work which includes involvement with the urban agriculture movement, being the fiscal agent for Garden for the Environment, raising thousands of native plants, and holding classes on composting. He stated that the organization is a viable part of what is going on in San Francisco and would like to be a bigger part of the Strategic Plan.

Mr. David Pilpel provided the following suggestions:

- The preamble or bullet points do not address highest and best use. More should be done to retrieve products from the waste stream that are still usable and can be reused.
- Elaborate on what references to "11-13" means because it is not cited in the document title. Director Nutter explained that 11-13 references fiscal years 2011 to 2013.
- Provide more detail for each bullet point about how plans are to be carried out. Provide regular reports to the Commission on progress, success, and obstacles for each of these points.
- Add Extended Producer Responsibility for packaging as a goal with staff allocation. Determine whether Toxics, Zero Waste, Public Outreach or a combination of all programs should share in this goal and how.
- The Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance has helped considerably. It is important to screen facilities and truck loads as early as possible to separate any wrong material. Recology has funding to provide this service and should provide additional staffing for this effort.
- Mr. Rhoads talked about the importance of HANC. Expand the reference in the Strategic Plan to other non-profits and their importance to the waste system.
- Accomplish more reuse through the Public Recycling and Disposal Area (PRDA). There is an opportunity for non-profits to participate more in this area.
- Reinforce meaningful public and stakeholder participation to avoid the uncertainty of the rate process for all parties.
- There is a composting council conference at the end of the month that staff is participating in and would be an interesting report for the Commission at the next meeting.

Mr. Jake Grumbach suggested that the Zero Waste team consult and/or partner with the Department of Public Health, the East Bay Alliance for Climate Education, Southeast Food Alliance, and PG&E on their successful outreach programs. He stated that the Department of Public Health has workgroups and a good framework for partnering with non-profits, stakeholders, and other community groups to add waste prevention and composting in school curricula. He suggested that young people be sent to schools that only do paper recycling to teach composting. Mr. Haley pointed out that the Department has a School Education program that is doing such things.

B. **Urban Forestry and Urban Agriculture.** Staff Presenter: Mei Ling Hui, Urban Forestry Council Coordinator

Director Nutter discussed the Department's desire for the Urban Forestry and Urban Agriculture programs to grow and flourish. She explained that Ms. Hui is the sole staff assigned to work on both of

these programs. This is the first Urban Agriculture Strategic Plan that the Commissioners will be reviewing. It is the first step in segregating the plan away from the Environmental Justice program into its own program.

Urban Forestry Program

Ms. Hui reported that the Street Tree Action Plan sets forth a goal for tree planting by doubling the number of street trees from the 2004 level by planting an additional 5000 trees per year for 20 years. She discussed San Francisco's specific climate and infrastructure limitations that may restrict the possibility of reaching canopy coverage similar to the national average of about 27%. The most recent study suggests that San Francisco has approximately 12% canopy. (Urban Forest Program Strategic Plan Draft narrative paragraphs 2 and 3.) She explained that a bigger issue affecting the urban forest is a continual loss of trees due to benign neglect or illegal removal because of construction. It is hard to monitor those two causes. The Department of Public Works and the Recreation and Park Department consistently report that they do not have enough staff to provide the level of care that their trees require. She is working with the Urban Forestry Council to review existing policies around construction and how a tree is noted for protection status.

Ms. Hui reported that the Urban Forest Program has one goal to promote a healthy and sustainable urban forest. Objectives and actions set forth to achieve that goal is outlined in the Urban Forest Program Strategic Plan Draft. Objectives include (a) implementing the Urban Forestry Council Ordinance; (b) promoting education and outreach programs and providing information on city tree management and related activities; and (c) developing innovative long-term funding strategies for urban forestry programs. This goal includes increasing the size of the urban forest and providing better maintenance for trees. The majority of programmatic activities are to support the Urban Forestry Council, the advisory body to the Mayor, Board of Supervisors and City departments on policy and programmatic issues that will improve the health of the urban forest. Ms. Hui stated that the most important objective is to identify ways to improve funding streams that can be applied to tree planting and tree care.

Director Nutter discussed differences between the City's tree planting goals and those of the Department's. As with some of the other Department programs, City and Department goals may be the same or not based on available resources to implement the goal. In this case, the Department acknowledges the City goal and wants to help that City goal, but has not adopted it due to a lack of resources. The Department is leading the effort for the Urban Forest Program on the goal of planting 100,000 new street trees in 20 years and ensuring funding for maintenance. Ms. Hui stated that the Urban Forestry Council commissioned the Street Tree Action Plan so that planting 100,000 new street trees would not only be a City goal, but adopted internally and citywide.

Commissioner Gravanis provided the following comments:

- Provide a definition of what the urban forest is.
- Elaborate how the 100,000 street trees translate into trees per lot or mile. The goals for street tree planting are excellent.
- Second paragraph of the narrative: do not compare San Francisco's total canopy to those of cities that have been previously occupied by tree-dominated landscapes. There should be an understanding that San Francisco's climate is different from those cities that a comparison is being made to. The fact that we only have a 12% total canopy should not be troubling and may be the right amount for this location. Biodiversity expertise and goals should guide the overall tree planting goal. Do not refer to San Francisco's climate restrictions. Our climate should be guiding our decisions of how many trees we plant and where we plant them. It should not be regarded as a restriction on what humans want to do and impose on our natural heritage. Include a discussion of tree planting to make that distinction. Tree planting can be just as harmful to biodiversity as it is

helpful if the wrong tree is selected for the wrong location. The Department of the Environment does not have the resources to state meaningful goals for our overall canopy.
- Avoid duplication of tree planting efforts between the Department and Friends of the Urban Forest so there is a clear sense of what the Department's value is to this effort.
- San Francisco Arbor Day should be held in the fall not the spring.
- Focus more on outreach events; e.g., more maintenance workshops and tree tours.
- Developing long-term funding strategies is an excellent objective.
- Do not devote additional time to the benefits of trees to climate change. An increasing number of studies show that planting trees in temperate climates do not help global warming. Studies also show that other kinds of vegetation such as grasslands sequester carbon as well as trees do.
- Explore the cost-effectiveness of having street tree maintenance done by private homeowners compared with having homeowners pay a fee for City government to provide this service.

Ms. Hui stated that even though San Francisco's climate is different than New York's, a comparison is being made because New York is a city with buildings, streets, and people that is thought of as being super-urban. Since San Francisco wants to increase its canopy, this comparison helps people understand why our goals are so important. Commissioner Gravanis stated that would be acceptable for street trees and encouraged competing with New York City for the number of street trees per mile, but it should not sound as if it is wrong for San Francisco not to have the same coverage for the total city. It makes people think that we need to go out and plant in open spaces and natural areas, which could be detrimental to our goal of biodiversity. She suggested that it be stated in a way so as to protect our indigenous ecosystems.

Ms. Hui stated that in comparing the work of the Department with Friends of the Urban Forest, the Department's goals are more focused on policy than hands-on work. She explained there are upcoming programs where there may be an overlap (Urban Orchards) where there will be programming partnerships with other City departments and agencies. The same problem is being worked on in different areas. Ms. Hui reported that she does hold one maintenance workshop a year for City employees that work on trees which is a requirement of the Ordinance that created the Urban Forestry Council. For the most part, holding workshops is more of a Friends of the Urban Forest activity. There may be ways to partner with them through an outreach program to highlight the maintenance programs that they do or to influence people to attend tree tours.

Commissioner Prakash inquired if the resource constraints are with project development or implementation. He asked who manages the volunteers and would be planting the 5000 trees per year for 20 years that the Street Tree Action Plan calls for. Ms. Hui stated that the Street Tree Action Plan was a report based off of a study of how many street trees San Francisco has and how many spaces are available for new street trees. The result was that there was room for 100,000 new street trees. The Department of Public Works, Friends of the Urban Forest and the Recreation and Park Department does the tree planting in the city.

Commissioner Prakash suggested partnering with young organizations that do volunteer work, e.g., City Year. Ms. Hui reported that Friends of the Urban Forest has a youth training program that was funded recently through the Department of the Environment. The Recreation and Park Department has an active volunteer program, and they invite other groups and volunteer-connector organizations to work with them mostly on planting, not maintenance. Friends of the Urban Forest provides the best opportunities on learning how to maintain trees. The Department of Public Works also has many volunteer opportunities, e.g., a street clean team program that is held once a month, and there is always greening and other maintenance projects.

Commissioner Wald asked if the Urban Forest Program Strategic Plan document would be used as a way to prioritize future Department work and fundraising priorities. Director Nutter stated that it has been brought to her attention that the Urban Forest Program is one of the plans that high goals have been set

for, but does not have the resources to ensure that goals will be met department or citywide. Most of the other strategic plans are either fully funded or close to fully funded including the stretch goals. This is a document that demonstrated the stark difference in what we have and where we need to get. It won't require taking resources from other programs, but additional opportunities will be sought after to fund this program. She discussed the most recent funding opportunity through Eco Media to pull together all city tree planting efforts among city agencies. The Urban Forest Program is one area that she and the Grants Manager are seeking new opportunities through grant or foundation funding. Director Nutter explained that the City does not currently have a Greening Director, and other agencies have resource constraints for tree maintenance. Ms. Hui stated that she is looking for funding so that the Department can expand its program and for other agencies to do the actual hands-on work.

Commissioner Wald stated that she approves of connecting the urban forestry program to the climate program because it does provide a contribution to address climate. She suggested adding a discussion in the preamble about the contribution that street trees could make to the climate in lieu of the comparison with other cities' canopy coverage. There should be a statement as to why trees are valuable in cities and the contribution that they bring. Commissioner Gravanis suggested adding more about the contribution trees make to storm water management. Commissioner Wald stated that she does not want trees in natural areas, but doesn't want people to think that trees would be cut down in grasslands.

Ms. Hui reported that the Recreation and Park Department is working on the Recreation and Open Space Element that may address a lot of questions concerning land use planning and the natural areas program. The most recent funding from the Clean and Safe Neighborhoods Park Bond will provide the Recreation and Park Department with an opportunity to include tree maintenance. It is a capital improvement project. They are doing a lot of work categorizing their trees and the care they need as well as natural areas. When that is complete, that will provide the information that Commissioner Gravanis wants to have included. The information may not be included in the final Strategic Plan publication in March, but will be kept on the radar for the future year.

Public Comment: Mr. Nick Kline asked if because of resource restrictions there was attention to selection of certain species that require less care than others. Ms. Hui confirmed that trees that do best in this environment are being selected first. Acquiring the biggest healthiest tree with the least amount of input is also important as well as making sure that we are not planting too large of a percentage of one species. There is experimentation going on and some trees are being phased out because of some environmental concerns and disease. Commissioner Gravanis stated that some trees are also breaking sidewalks. Mr. Kline stated that Commissioner Gravanis had mentioned other benefits of having trees in an urban environment. Do urban trees help urban heat elements? Ms. Hui confirmed that they do. People think of it more as trees increasing the temperature within a city to reduce building energy loads. In San Francisco, a tree may actually increase building energy loads in some cases. We do have an urban heat element that affects outlying areas more than energy usage in the urban city. It is less of an issue for us than in areas such as Sacramento.

Urban Agriculture Program

Ms. Hui discussed her background in ecological agriculture that fits in with the key role she has been assigned in working on the Mayor's 2009 Directive on Healthy and Sustainable Foods Policy. There has been a movement building in urban agriculture by the Urban Agriculture Alliance and other community advisory groups such as the Mayor's Food Security Task Force. Ms. Hui has been working with these groups to help direct that movement so it has a clear direction. (See Urban Agriculture Strategic Plan Draft narrative.)

Ms. Hui reported that the Urban Agriculture program has one goal to "increase food production and opportunities for urban gardening in San Francisco." She reported on actions to be worked on for objectives that include (a) supporting policy initiatives; (b) building capacity of existing City programs; and

(c) supporting community organization and public education and information campaigns. (See Urban Agriculture Strategic Plan Goals, Objectives, and Actions.)

Ms. Hui stated that she is supporting the Planning Department and Mayor's Office efforts to create an urban agriculture zoning designation. University of San Francisco interns will be conducting an existing resource and resource gaps assessment to establish the baseline of current activities and opportunities for improvement. In addition, the Planning Department will be creating a map showing existing opportunities for urban gardening in San Francisco. One issue that is not currently being addressed in the City is commercial agriculture. There are several groups that produce food, but no one is succeeding yet. Presidio School of Management is assisting with a study to assess barriers facing production-focused models. A study will be conducted on common environmental toxins that may affect produce quality common in San Francisco. Ms. Hui elaborated on Objectives B to build capacity of existing City programs and C to support community organization and public education and information campaigns as outlined in the Strategic Plan Draft.

Commissioner Wald provided a funding referral for the Urban Agriculture program. Commissioner Gravanis stated that she is impressed with the program and it is something that San Francisco has needed for a long time. Community gardens did not have a home for a while, and it is nice to see it is moving forward. She suggested that the Strategic Plan Draft include narrative on how this program would relate to and provide benefits to the environment so that it can be justified as a Department of the Environment program, e.g., reducing the carbon footprint from transportation of food from other areas, controlling the use of toxic pesticide may be easier with local food. Ms. Hui stated that this program is very much like the Urban Forest Program in that it is uniquely positioned to collaborate, direct policy and programming ideas with all agencies that might be involved with urban agriculture in the City so everyone is supporting one another.

Commissioner Prakash inquired why there is such a high failure rate for commercial agriculture in the city and if the studies would help prove the reasons why. He asked if there are other cities that are leaders in urban farming that could be consulted for ideas. Ms. Hui explained that San Francisco has a long history of farming. When there was more open space, there were cows in Cow Hollow. Cuba, which is a highly urbanized area, is very successful at urban farming. San Francisco does have different climate conditions than other cities and different opportunities because of how our buildings are structured. New York puts a lot of emphasis on rooftop gardens. San Francisco does not have a freezing climate so buildings do not have a snow-load and can't actually hold the weight of a garden. We are trying to identify ways to approach and find land and resources to promote urban agriculture. San Francisco's situation is unique, and we have specific issues to deal with. Commissioner Prakash asked if there is another city that is comparable to San Francisco that has had a metric of success. Ms. Hui stated that she is looking into Seattle, Portland and some cities in Canada for comparisons and what can be adjusted to fit for us. Business plans and land access issues may be reasons that commercial agriculture was not successful in the past. Director Nutter explained that this is another program that San Francisco can lead the way and make an impact on. Foundations are looking to San Francisco to provide their expertise. Ms. Hui explained that the urban agriculture model is meant to grow and produce food that will reduce the carbon impact of our local food chain and increase urban sustainability and resiliency.

Commissioner Wald stated that this program should be connected with the Environmental Justice program so that there is an emphasis on serving underserved neighborhoods. Ms. Hui stated that she is working with the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project, a longtime advocate for urban farm installations. The Treasure Island Redevelopment Plan is also looking at insuring that urban farms are maintained. She confirmed that the environmental justice connection would be made.

Public Comment: Mr. Jake Grumbach discussed a complaint that he heard from the Urban Agriculture Alliance about permitting/zoning barriers for someone who wanted to start their own urban garden on an unused private lot. Ms. Hui reported that there will be a code designation introduced for farms in the city

to allow for sale of produce. If you are going to grow produce for yourself, you can do whatever you want on your land. If you want to sell what you produce, there is a question about this type of business in residential areas. A farm does not qualify as a home office. Little City Gardens is an example of an empty lot in a residential area which is being addressed.

Mr. Grumbach discussed Department of Public Health urban agriculture initiatives in the environmental justice arena especially in southeast part of the city. He suggested that the Department identify an environmental angle and not a health angle and create a distribution model similar to Project Open Hand. Ms. Hui stated that she works with the Health Department on these and other Department programs.

5. **Agenda Process for Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meetings.** (Discussion) Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald

   Commissioner Wald asked Commissioners to provide their suggestions for an organizing principle for agenda setting in order to maximize efficiency of Commissioner-time and effectiveness of the Commission role. She reported that agenda setting was previously driven by the Urban Environmental Accords and now by a running list (Future Agenda Items Checklist) of agenda items and ideas that the Commission Secretary keeps track of. The New Business/Future Agenda Items topic on each agenda has been used effectively to set agendas for future meetings. In addition, the Committee Chair, Director and Commission Secretary meet before each meeting to set the agenda for the next meeting through the topics listed on the checklist and Commissioner ideas.

   Commissioner Prakash stated that he would send agenda ideas to the Committee Chair. He suggested creating an online secure depository for agenda suggestions that Commissioners/ designated staff could access that would serve as a one-way communication path. Commissioners and/or the Commission Secretary could monitor the site for agenda suggestions. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that Department staff keep Commissioners apprised of issues that should be addressed in addition to items that are legally required such as the Reduced Risk Pesticide List, the Strategic Plan, etc. She asked that a review be made of each item that is proposed to determine the most effective way to deal with that issue, e.g., which Committee should the issue go to, should it go to the Committee first or full Commission only, could the item be presented as a written report.

6. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

   Director Nutter provided an update on legislation and policy as follows:

   - The Drug Disposal Ordinance that was moving through the Board of Supervisors last year was postponed by Supervisor Mirkarimi. A new Board and Mayor will be looking at that Ordinance, but it has not yet been scheduled. The Ordinance would mandate that drug manufacturers identify an industry-led disposal program to remove pharmaceuticals out of our water and landfills.

   - The Commercial Building Ordinance which basically mandates that any commercial buildings in San Francisco over 10,000 square feet are required to have benchmarking of their energy use as well as an energy audit within three years was postponed. It is currently at the Land Use Committee.

   - The California Energy Commission approved updates to the Green Building Code and Commercial Lighting Ordinance that combined all requirements of CalGreen with stricter local requirements that became effective January 1, 2011. The Green Building Team spent a lot of time making sure that CalGreen included San Francisco standards, and that there wasn't going to be any conflict moving forward. That was a huge victory on the policy side.

- The annual holiday tree reuse media event with Recology and Recreation and Park Department was held at City Hall. Kevin Drew of the Zero Waste team was the spokesperson and got a lot of media coverage about how your holiday tree can be reused.

- A $250,000 grant was received from the Frank Foundation to plan for how San Francisco can be renewable by 2020. A series of meetings will be held with the Public Utilities Commission and the Power Plant Task Force who have done a lot of work on the Electricity Resource Plan to insure that efforts are not duplicated and to review past work on how to be more energy-efficient and find renewable sources of power for San Francisco. A new Program Manager will be hired to oversee that program. The deliverable will be an actual plan on how to accomplish this effort within that timeframe.

- An Electric Vehicle Regional Task Force is forming through an initiative of our Department, the Bay Area Climate Collaborative and a number of other entities that are pulling together electric vehicle thought leaders regionally to think through what the infrastructure will look like, where resources will come from and how electric vehicles will become a reality. The focus will be on transit first, but we want to make sure that we make the best use of our investment. This is the time to make policy decisions for the city and regionally.

- It is budget season and a series of meetings will be held. The Commission will be seeing a draft budget at the January meeting.

- The Policy Committee will be reviewing Strategic Plan Drafts in February for Clean Transportation, Public Outreach and School Education, and the Director's Report. The full Commission will hear a presentation on the full Strategic Plan for final comments and approval at their March meeting.

- Commissioner Martin has resigned from the Commission, and Mayor Newsom has appointed a new Commissioner, Jason Elliott, on January 6, 2011.

Commissioner Gravanis asked for a future report on America's Cup and what the Department of the Environment and Commission can do to assist in making this event environmentally sustainable.

7. **Announcements.** (Discussion)

Commissioner Gravanis announced that there is a Global Tap station at the UC Parnassus Student Union. Commissioner Wald announced that there are also stations at the United Concourse and Yerba Buena Park, and that there would be a hard roll out of stations the week of January 20. Ms. Knowles reported that she has heard that another station will be located at Crissy Field or the San Francisco Birding Area. Commissioner Gravanis encouraged everyone not to focus on the particular brand of station, but on the overall goal of getting people to refill their bottles through various ways.

Director Nutter announced that the Department is holding an Arts Open House this Thursday from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. The Green Business Awards will be held on January 19 at the Green Room, War Memorial, from 6:00 – 9:00 p.m. There will be 40 – 50 awards given out for businesses that have reached their green business certification.

8. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)

   Commissioner Wald reported that the February 14 meeting will include continuation of a review of Program Area Strategic Plan drafts and the Director's Draft Plan and a status report on the Literacy for Environmental Justice Herons Head Eco Center.

   Ms. Knowles proposed creating a reward for Supervisor Emeritus Sophie Maxwell for her work assisting the environmental community and the Asthma Task Force by influencing the Housing Authority to conduct a pilot Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program at the Sunnydale housing units. The ultimate goal is to create a policy in San Francisco for the Housing Authority to practice IPM because it is not a requirement. A discussion was held on ways that the Commission could present such an award to Commissioner Emeritus Maxwell to let her know her effort is appreciated. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that the Commission consider a commendation Resolution. The idea of the Department or Commission issuing Environmental Pioneer Awards was discussed. Commissioner Wald suggested that the Policy Committee hold a more extensive discussion on establishing an annual Environmental Pioneer award process. She suggested that the Commission do a commendation Resolution and that Mark Leno request a Resolution from the legislature commending her for this effort.

9. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

10. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary, Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, February 14, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

Approved: February 14, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS DEPT

FEB - 8 2011

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

3.71

4/11
scheduled

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULED MEETING AND AGENDA
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2011, 4:00 P.M.
CITY HALL, ROOM 421
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

***NOTE: The Monday, February 14, 2011, 5:00 p.m. meeting of the Commission on the Environment Policy Committee has been RESCHEDULED to February 14, 2011 at 4:00 p.m.**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS
Public comment will be taken before the Committee takes action on any item.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.**
2. **Approval of Minutes of the January 10, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: January 10, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)
3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
4. **Draft Strategic Plans Presentation and Commissioner Feedback on Department Program Areas.** Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter and Commissioner Johanna Wald (Explanatory Documents: Draft Strategic Plans) (Informational Presentations and Discussion)
   - **Public Outreach and School Education.** Speakers: Mark Westlund, Public Outreach Manager (10 minutes) and Tamar Hurwitz, School Education Manager (10 minutes)
   - **Clean Transportation.** Speaker: Bob Hayden, Manager, Transportation Programs (10 minutes)
   - **Department Wide Priorities & Initiatives.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (15 minutes)
5. **Update on the Treasure Island Draft Sustainability Plan.** (Discussion) (Explanatory Documents: - Link to the current draft Sustainability Plan http://sftreasureisland.org/ftp/devdocs/Draft%20Sustainability%20Plan%201-28-2011.pdf; Citizens Advisory Board Staff Report; List of TICD Obligations; Green Building Specs for LEED ND) Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter; Speakers: Michael Tymoff Deputy Director, Treasure Island Redevelopment Project, Mayors Office of Economic and Workforce Development (MOWED), Jean Rodgers Principal ARUP, Kheay Loke Project Manager TICD (30 minutes)
6. **Director's Report and Updates** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)
7. **Announcements.** (Discussion)
8. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)

9. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
10. **Adjournment.**

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary, Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 14, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee , or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org within three business days of a meeting. If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Commission Policy Committee after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Department of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 during normal office hours or will be made available at the Policy Committee meeting website link https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee as attachments included with the agenda or meeting minutes.

Important Information

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the Committee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Committee members. Any written comments should be sent to: Commission Secretary of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. of the day prior to the hearing. Comments which cannot be delivered to the Commission Secretary by that time may be taken directly to the hearing at the location above. When bringing handouts to meetings, please photocopy on both sides of the paper and try to use post-consumer recycled or tree-free paper. Also, please bring sufficient copies of handouts for the Committee, the Commission Secretary and the public.

Public Comment

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but are not on today's agenda. Public comment will be taken following each agendized item. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes, unless otherwise announced by the Chair. If it is demonstrated that the comments by the public will exceed 15 minutes, the Chair may continue Public Comment to another time during the meeting.

The Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue not appearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In response to public comment, not on an agendized item, the Committee is limited to:

1. Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
2. Request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
3. Directing staff to place the item or issue on a future agenda (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Disability Access

The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meeting will be held at City Hall, Room 421, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, in the Civic Center area. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the Civic Center Station at United Nations Plaza and Market Street. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro Stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For information about MUNI accessible services call (415) 923-6142. There is accessible curbside parking adjacent to City Hall on Grove Street and Van Ness Avenue and in the vicinity of the Veterans Building at 401 Van Ness Avenue adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Monica Fish at (415) 355-3709 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call the Mayor's Office on Disability at (415) 554-6789 or (415) 554-6799 (TTY) for further information.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance
(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Sunshine Task Force Administrator, City Hall, Room 409, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683 at Phone No.: (415) 554-7724; Fax No.: (415) 554-7854; E-mail: sotf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3112; web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Posted: February 8, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

FEB 24 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

RESCHEDULED MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2011, 4:00 P.M.
CITY HALL, ROOM 421
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

***NOTE: The Monday, February 14, 2011, 5:00 p.m. meeting of the Commission on the Environment Policy Committee was RESCHEDULED to February 14, 2011 at 4:00 p.m.**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Policy Committee meeting convened at 4:07 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald, Gravanis and Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the January 10, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: January 10, 2011 Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Prakash, second by Commissioner Gravanis, the January 10, 2011 Draft Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Commissioners Wald, Gravanis and Prakash)

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

Items 7 -8 were heard before Item 4.

4. **Draft Strategic Plans Presentation and Commissioner Feedback on Department Program Areas.** Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter and Commissioner Johanna Wald (Explanatory Documents: Draft Strategic Plans) (Informational Presentations and Discussion)

    - **Public Outreach and School Education.** Speakers: Mark Westlund, Public Outreach Manager and Tamar Hurwitz, School Education Manager

      Mr. Westlund presented the Public Outreach Draft Strategic Plan for 2011-13. He discussed what the Public Outreach program does, program history, impact opportunities, goals, objectives, and actions (see Public Outreach Draft Strategic Plan).

Commissioner Gravanis inquired if the outreach message would reach people who do not have the latest technologies available to them. Mr. Westlund confirmed that would be the case and messages would also be targeted to diverse cultures in various languages. Commissioner Prakash inquired about the social media tools that would be used to relay the outreach message and guide people on where and how to access information. Mr. Westlund reported that the Department is working on (1) redoing its website to make it more interactive and adding a blogging component; (2) continuing its messages on Twitter and Facebook, and (3) an IPhone and Smart Phone EcoFinder application with Bay Area counties to create a regional searchable database to make Eco Finder a more usable tool that cities can import into their own websites and populate their own data. Director Nutter reported that UserVoice technology is also being researched.

Commissioner Wald suggested incorporating metrics for each goal into the plan in order to measure success of programs. Mr. Westlund and Director Nutter reported that metrics are being tracked on a monthly basis and would be added to the final plan. Commissioners commended Mr. Westlund and the Outreach team on their ambitious and comprehensive plan.

Ms. Hurwitz presented on the Environmental School Education Draft Strategic Plan for 2011-13. She discussed what the Education program does, program history, impact opportunities, goals, objectives and actions (see Education Strategic Plan Draft).

Commissioner Gravanis suggested that K-12 educational materials be made adaptable to adults once resources become available. She commended the inclusion of biodiversity in the program. Ms. Hurwitz stated that adult outreach is the focus of the Public Outreach team, but would be happy to work on adapting the material to an adult population. She stated that some of the factsheets are written at a level that can be applicable to an adult audience and are being used in that way.

Commissioner Prakash inquired if there is an incentive for students to get involved with Food to Flowers and how it is marketed on campuses. He suggested holding inter-school competitions to motivate students. Ms. Hurwitz stated that current strategies are working effectively to bring the recycling and composting message to life, e.g., poster competitions, partnership with Alliance for Climate Change, Phoebe the Phoenix mascot, school assemblies, and slideshows. A cost-benefit analysis would have to be worked on before considering inter-school competitions.

Commissioners acknowledged Ms. Hurwitz and the Environmental Education team for bringing this program to another level and for their good work. She asked if the fifty-percent diversion goal is good enough for the schools. Ms. Hurwitz reported that the fifty-percent figure is a benchmark and is the lowest diversion rate aimed for, but that a lot of schools reach a higher level. Commissioner Wald suggested adding information about specific behavioral change goals that would help measure success at the end of the year. She asked if the number of field trips is limited by funding. Ms. Hurwitz reported that the number of field trips is a target number that has been in place since the beginning of the program. There are budgetary allowances to pay for buses so the number fluctuates each year. It also becomes more expensive to administer the program with more teachers in attendance. Commissioner Wald suggested that there be a teacher award program in addition to a school awards ceremony. Ms. Hurwitz stated that would be a good idea that would be considered.

Public Comment: Mr. Nick Kline inquired about the use of guerilla tactics in advertising. Mr. Westlund stated that guerilla advertising includes posting advertising and outreach messages in public spaces or at public events. Commissioner Prakash explained that it is a bombardment of messages in order to get the message across.

- **Clean Transportation.** Speaker: Bob Hayden, Manager, Transportation Programs.

  Mr. Hayden discussed the evolvement of the Clean Air program into the Clean Transportation program. He introduced Ms. Mari Hunter, Ms. Adeline Canez and Ms. Krute Singa who work on Transportation Demand Management programs. Mr. Hayden presented on the Clean Transportation Program's Draft Strategic Plan for 2011-13. He discussed the challenge and vision, policy framework, Department's role that characterizes the implementation of the programs, and goals, objectives and actions (see Clean Transportation Program Draft Strategic Plan).

  Commissioner Prakash inquired about the Department's relationships with companies such as CarShare, ZipCar, etc. Mr. Hayden reported that the City is supportive of car-share programs and helped establish City CarShare as a nonprofit organization. There has been discussion with car-share companies on ways to integrate plug-in vehicles into their fleets and be involved in the electric vehicle infrastructure once it is set up. One of the challenges to electric vehicle ownership is that condo and apartment house residents or people who do not have a garage do not have a place to plug in an electric vehicle. One answer is to encourage and increase car share pods in areas where there is a high concentration of those housing units and incorporate plug-in vehicles into car-share fleets.

  Commissioner Prakash inquired about the Department's marketing and outreach approach to consumers and stakeholders on the financial benefits of car-share programs. Mr. Hayden stated that is an area that the Department could move into, but is not equipped to do so at this time. The most aggressive outreach at this time is centered on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs. It is possible that the Clean Cities Coalition can help leverage the message in the future. Commissioner Prakash inquired about the number of electric vehicle plug-in stations located in San Francisco. Mr. Hayden stated that there are less than a dozen charge stations in place that are geared toward new technologies, but installation of new stations in public garages and City-owned properties is in progress. Commercial establishments that have retail parking lots are starting to install stations as well.

  Commissioner Gravanis suggested that the Strategic Plan include a goal to reduce car ownership by utilizing car share programs. Mr. Hayden stated that people are far less inclined to purchase a vehicle if they know that a car share program is available. Commissioner Gravanis stated that the plan should also acknowledge the carbon footprint in the manufacturing and delivery of cars as well as the materials and energy required to produce them. She stated that there are other environmental issues involved in reducing car ownership in addition to clean air and green house gas reductions.

  Commissioner Wald suggested including metrics into the Strategic Plan. Example: expanding emergency ride programs. How many businesses are currently enrolled in the program and what a reasonable goal for the coming year should be? Include a definition of what expand means in order to have a sense of what it is we are trying to achieve. Another example would be to measure progress from days that people are not supposed to get in their car, e.g. Walk SF, Sunday Streets. Mr. Hayden stated that some metrics are achievable now and others can be developed.

  Commissioner Wald suggested including goals in connection with the America's Cup so that there is alternative transportation available to the event in place of single-passenger vehicles, e.g. setting up buses, trains, and car pools to transport people to the event and parking lots/garages outside of the city. Then measure the progress in order to give people a sense that it can be done. Mr. Hayden stated that these types of recommendations have been made to the America's Cup

Planning Committee, e.g., bike pods, car share. Director Nutter reported that proposals, timelines and budgets are currently being submitted to the Event Committee so that they can review their priorities and determine what can be funded.

Commissioner Prakash inquired about the level of communication between departments in order to make substantive changes to city infrastructure so that environmental objectives can be achieved. Director Nutter reported that there has been some coordination and more needs to be done. The Municipal Transportation Authority has innovative project plans and visions on how to inspire people to use alternate methods of transportation and get people out of their cars. She reported on her meeting with the Deputy Mayor of Vienna and the Deputy Director of the Municipal Transportation Authority on this topic. A department director meeting is planned to discuss department coordination at the program level. Commissioner Wald discussed the concept of linking departments and programs for this purpose.

Public Comment

Ms. Lurilla Harris stated that there is a large population of handicapped people in San Francisco and inquired whether consideration has been given to making accessible vehicles available so that they can continue driving rather than be victims of paratransit. She expressed her concern with the level of service provided by vans that are contracted out by MUNI.

Ms. Miriam Gordon inquired why there is a shortage of MUNI passes for people with commuter checks. Ms. Canez responded that in April, the Muni fast pass is only going to be available on the Clipper Card and so the physical paper passes will not be available. Now what you can do is take your commuter check and a Clipper Card and go to a retail vendor (Walgreens) to add the pass electronically onto your card. For more information on retail vendors you can go to clippercard.com. SFMTA is the agency responsible for the passes and the Muni transit service so any direct questions about passes and availability should be directed to them. Ms. Singa added that since the passes are electronic now, there will not be a shortage. Ms. Harris stated that there should be more publicity on where you can add money to the Clipper Card.

- **Department Wide Priorities & Initiatives.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director. Department Wide Priorities and Initiatives was continued to the March 14, 2011 Policy Committee meeting.

5. **Update on the Treasure Island Draft Sustainability Plan.** (Discussion) (Explanatory Documents: Executive Summary to the Policy Committee, Link to the current draft Sustainability Plan http://sftreasureisland.org/index.aspx?page=254; Citizens Advisory Board Staff Report; List of TICD Obligations; Green Building Specs for LEED ND, Presentation) Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter; Speakers: Michael Tymoff Deputy Director, Treasure Island Redevelopment Project, Mayors Office of Economic and Workforce Development (MOWED), Jean Rodgers Principal ARUP, Kheay Loke, Project Manager TICD

Mr. Michael Tymoff introduced himself and the project team consisting of Ms. Jean Rogers, Principal ARUP, Mr. Kheay Loke, Project Manager, TICD; Mr. Jack Robertson and Mr. Stephen Proud of Lennar. Mr. Tymoff provided an informational presentation on the Draft Sustainability Plan for the Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Project (see Executive Summary to the Policy Committee). He stated that the Sustainability Plan, as updated from the 2006 Plan, is a policy document that would be adopted by Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) at the time of final project approvals and would be a flexible plan that would allow for updates throughout the course of the project. He discussed changes from the 2006 plan to the current reiteration of the Plan.

Mr. Kheay Loke reported on all positive aspects of the 2006 and recent reiteration of the plan that is in accordance with the Department of the Environment's program goals. It takes into account an environmentally sustainable approach toward climate change, transportation, walk-ability, energy efficiency/renewable energy, site design and land, water, waste, community, green building and neighborhood design standards and many other sustainable practices.

Ms. Jean Rogers presented on the 2011 Sustainability Plan discussing the comprehensive vision for sustainability, what's changed in the world from 2006-11, and what's changed in the Plan to include changes in local and state regulations, advances in green technology (rising energy standards and new incentives and developments for green technology), and evolution of the project. A presentation was given on the Sustainability Plan on topics of community, transportation, integrated sustainable design (energy, water and waste), climate change and resilience, and economic viability. Each chapter of the Sustainability Plan includes objectives, strategies, targets and benefits for each focus area (see Sustainability at-a-Glance slide). Ms. Rogers stated that TICD would be codifying environmental sustainability obligations in their Design for Development Agreement in the areas of land use, transportation and infrastructure, energy and water, and community benefits. Presentation topics are outlined in the presentation explanatory document.

Commissioner Gravanis provided the following suggestions to the Sustainability Plan:

- Habitat Management Plan and Biodiversity. (1) To the biodiversity reference in the plan, add at least a paragraph that addresses that one of the elements of sustainability is the natural world and the non-human species, and that implementation of the biological diversity goal would include the protection and restoration of natural occurring habitat on Yerba Buena Island; (2) add other aspects of biodiversity such as bird-safe facades and Integrated Pest Management in the context of non-human species; (3) specify what components of habitat management will be protected; and (4) the last Draft Habitat Management Plan only dealt with terrestrial habitats. Include other aspects of biological resources such as, aquatic and inter-tidal habitats, and eel-grass beds.
- Behavior Change. Add a discussion of future tenant behavior, management of pets, individuals' night lighting, and not feeding wildlife.
- Parking ratios. Provide education to reduce parking and car ownership. The fewer cars there are, the cheaper the housing is, because there would be less need to build parking accommodations, and there would be more real estate available for public benefits as well as other revenue-generating activities.
- Ground Mounted Solar Panels. Solar panels should not use up open space; they should go on every roof and wall as much as possible.
- Driving. Add under TICD sustainability obligations under land use, to lessen or eliminate the need for driving.
- Urban Agricultural Park. How much of that park will be used for community gardens for individuals to use? Provide a lot of space for people to do their own gardening as opposed to only revenue producing and or educational facilities.
- Remediation work. There is discussion about how developers will continue to clean up beyond what the Navy will do. Will institutional controls be avoided that have been talked about in the past? Make sure that community gardens are going to be clean enough so people can grow produce. More information is required on the cleanup.
- Term usage. Use the term climate appropriate, not drought-tolerant plantings.
- CEQA Requirements. Protection of sensitive species is all that CEQA requires, but more should be done to not only protect sensitive species, but entire habitats.
- Car sharing. Add promotion of mandatory car-sharing in larger residential and commercial projects.

- Transit Pass. Change wording to state that a transit pass will be included in the Home Owners Association fee.
- Rental Housing. Provide for the needs of San Franciscans of all income levels who want to rent instead of buy.

Commissioner Wald expressed her concern that decisions are going to have to be made about what strategies are to be employed, and she is unclear as to when those decisions will be made and how and when they will be communicated so it is known what they are, and a determination can be made as to whether they have been done or not.

Mr. Tymoff offered to share the scheduled performance that is attached to the Design for Development Agreement (DDA) and the phasing diagram. He explained that the agreement that the City and TIDA have with TICD is that they prepare all of the infrastructure and the land for development, and in exchange they have the right to sell that land to home builders for development. A major phase application will be submitted to TIDA and City agencies to review the infrastructure. When they are ready to construct, they will submit a greater level of detail of design drawings for a sub-phase, which is typically about a block, that will include the adjacent parks and open space and all the public right of ways that will have to be provided, outside completion dates for all of those parks and open space, and the ancillary public benefits. Included with that is a contribution or subsidy for affordable housing that would be paid to TIDA. There is a clear mechanism by which the community facilities, subsidies for affordable housing, parks and open space, maintenance, transportation operating subsidy payments have to be made by the developer to TIDA. If they do not make those and fail to deliver their other obligations, they would be in default of the DDA.

Commissioner Wald stated that those are the specific terms in this Plan that had been put in a legally binding document. She stated that she does not understand the relationship between the legally binding document and the Sustainability Plan. Mr. Tymoff stated that there a number of components of the plan that were analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the ground mounted solar for example, so that when it is known who the power provider will be and when certain third parties would come to the table, there would be flexibility to implement that project. When that happens will be based on when it makes sense in terms of the build-out of the project, and it is known how many residents are there and what the rate base is.

Mr. Tymoff stated that with respect to the wastewater treatment plant, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (PUC) will construct and operate that plant, so they will make determinations on how the sludge will be used. Three different wetland scenarios have been covered in the EIR for treatment of wastewater and wetland pond applications. The PUC would determine the appropriate technologies for that. Other components such as a district and heating cooling plant will be provided by a third party. There will have to be technical and economic feasibility analyses done to understand the appropriate technology for mixed uses, and when it will be possible to amortize costs based on the rate structure and the size of the resident base. Somebody will not come in and build the district heating and cooling plant day one, there will be a critical trigger that TIDA will make decisions on. Mr. Tymoff stated that he would be happy to provide status reports back to the Department of the Environment at that time. There will be work with MTA, PUC, and various service providers to make these decisions in the future.

Commissioner Wald stated it would be useful to have some kind of document such as a matrix that shows who makes these decisions and when and how they will be made. Some decisions will be made by the PUC, others by TIDA, and the document and the plan would constrain the choices.

Director Nutter inquired about the timeline and when decisions would be made, specifically for the automated waste management system and district heating and cooling. She suggested that the

Department and Commission prioritize what some of those projects are in order to be able to engage at that point. For these particular projects because of their implications of uses throughout the city in other venues, the Department of the Environment would want to be a partner to help think through whether it would work for Treasure Island and offer their expertise on the pros and cons and how to leverage the projects throughout the city. It would be a way for the Department of the Environment to provide priority documents at the point projects are initiated.

Director Nutter suggested adding to the Plan (1) that there would be compliance with the Construction and Demolition Ordinance that the City passed because there will be so much construction and demolition as a part of this project; and (2) a discussion about the Commercial Green Building Ordinance that recently passed the Board last week that will mandate that all commercial buildings in San Francisco 10,000 square feet or over are required to do energy benchmarking and share that information through Energy Star and a web tool that we will have locally, as well as have an energy audit within the next three years.

Public Comment: Ms. Harris stated that the reference in the transportation slide that states there will be a 15-minute walking radius to a transit hub only applies to people who are not handicapped. She asked whether an accommodation would be made for the handicapped. Mr. Tymoff stated that there will be a free island shuttle that will stop in all the neighborhoods, two on Treasure Island, and two on Yerba Buena Island. He stated that Treasure Island has a flat landscape.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired as to when comments would need to be incorporated into the Plan. Mr. Tymoff stated that comments should be provided by March 1. All the final documents are scheduled to be submitted for recommendation to the Citizens Advisory Board on March 29 and the TIDA Board on April 7. He reported that Department of the Environment staff comments have been received.

6. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

   Director Nutter reported that (1) the landfill agreement was at the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee last week and was continued for two months; (2) No action was taken at a hearing today at the Board of Supervisors on the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Recycling Center (HANC); and (3) a press conference was held on the implementation of Global Tap at the San Francisco Airport.

7. **Announcements.** (Discussion) There were no announcements made at this time.

8. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion) Commissioner Wald on the recommendation of Commissioner Prakash requested a presentation at the March 14 meeting on new legislation proposed by the Board of Supervisors President David Chiu on Yellow Pages distribution and handbills. The project sponsor, representatives from the business community and Department staff would be invited to present on this proposal. Department staff would be asked to discuss energy and material savings. Mr. Westlund, Program Outreach Manager, reported that this issue is currently at the Board of Supervisors under the 30-day rule. Additional agenda items suggested for the March 14 meeting include (1) an update on the Heron's Head Eco Center; (2) staff report or written summary on Global Tap and eliminating single-serve water bottles at City events; (3) Department-wide Priorities and Initiatives Draft Strategic Plan; (4) San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority Climate Action Strategy report; and (5) America's Cup.

9. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

10. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary, Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 14, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

Approved:

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

APR 19 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

.71

'/11
roved

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

RESCHEDULED MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2011, 4:00 P.M.
CITY HALL, ROOM 421
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

NOTE: The Monday, February 14, 2011, 5:00 p.m. meeting of the Commission on the Environment Policy Committee was RESCHEDULED to February 14, 2011 at 4:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Policy Committee meeting convened at 4:07 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald, Gravanis and Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the January 10, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: January 10, 2011 Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Prakash, second by Commissioner Gravanis, the January 10, 2011 Draft Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Commissioners Wald, Gravanis and Prakash)

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

Items 7 -8 were heard before Item 4.

4. **Draft Strategic Plans Presentation and Commissioner Feedback on Department Program Areas.** Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter and Commissioner Johanna Wald (Explanatory Documents: Draft Strategic Plans) (Informational Presentations and Discussion)

   - **Public Outreach and School Education.** Speakers: Mark Westlund, Public Outreach Manager and Tamar Hurwitz, School Education Manager

     Mr. Westlund presented the Public Outreach Draft Strategic Plan for 2011-13. He discussed what the Public Outreach program does, program history, impact opportunities, goals, objectives, and actions (see Public Outreach Draft Strategic Plan).

Commissioner Gravanis inquired if the outreach message would reach people who do not have the latest technologies available to them. Mr. Westlund confirmed that would be the case and messages would also be targeted to diverse cultures in various languages. Commissioner Prakash inquired about the social media tools that would be used to relay the outreach message and guide people on where and how to access information. Mr. Westlund reported that the Department is working on (1) redoing its website to make it more interactive and adding a blogging component; (2) continuing its messages on Twitter and Facebook, and (3) an IPhone and Smart Phone EcoFinder application with Bay Area counties to create a regional searchable database to make Eco Finder a more usable tool that cities can import into their own websites and populate their own data. Director Nutter reported that UserVoice technology is also being researched.

Commissioner Wald suggested incorporating metrics for each goal into the plan in order to measure success of programs. Mr. Westlund and Director Nutter reported that metrics are being tracked on a monthly basis and would be added to the final plan. Commissioners commended Mr. Westlund and the Outreach team on their ambitious and comprehensive plan.

Ms. Hurwitz presented on the Environmental School Education Draft Strategic Plan for 2011-13. She discussed what the Education program does, program history, impact opportunities, goals, objectives and actions (see Education Strategic Plan Draft).

Commissioner Gravanis suggested that K-12 educational materials be made adaptable to adults once resources become available. She commended the inclusion of biodiversity in the program. Ms. Hurwitz stated that adult outreach is the focus of the Public Outreach team, but would be happy to work on adapting the material to an adult population. She stated that some of the factsheets are written at a level that can be applicable to an adult audience and are being used in that way.

Commissioner Prakash inquired if there is an incentive for students to get involved with Food to Flowers and how it is marketed on campuses. He suggested holding inter-school competitions to motivate students. Ms. Hurwitz stated that current strategies are working effectively to bring the recycling and composting message to life, e.g., poster competitions, partnership with Alliance for Climate Change, Phoebe the Phoenix mascot, school assemblies, and slideshows. A cost-benefit analysis would have to be worked on before considering inter-school competitions.

Commissioners acknowledged Ms. Hurwitz and the Environmental Education team for bringing this program to another level and for their good work. She asked if the fifty-percent diversion goal is good enough for the schools. Ms. Hurwitz reported that the fifty-percent figure is a benchmark and is the lowest diversion rate aimed for, but that a lot of schools reach a higher level. Commissioner Wald suggested adding information about specific behavioral change goals that would help measure success at the end of the year. She asked if the number of field trips is limited by funding. Ms. Hurwitz reported that the number of field trips is a target number that has been in place since the beginning of the program. There are budgetary allowances to pay for buses so the number fluctuates each year. It also becomes more expensive to administer the program with more teachers in attendance. Commissioner Wald suggested that there be a teacher award program in addition to a school awards ceremony. Ms. Hurwitz stated that would be a good idea that would be considered.

Public Comment: Mr. Nick Kline inquired about the use of guerilla tactics in advertising. Mr. Westlund stated that guerilla advertising includes posting advertising and outreach messages in public spaces or at public events. Commissioner Prakash explained that it is a bombardment of messages in order to get the message across.

- **Clean Transportation.** Speaker: Bob Hayden, Manager, Transportation Programs.

  Mr. Hayden discussed the evolvement of the Clean Air program into the Clean Transportation program. He introduced Ms. Mari Hunter, Ms. Adeline Canez and Ms. Krute Singa who work on Transportation Demand Management programs. Mr. Hayden presented on the Clean Transportation Program's Draft Strategic Plan for 2011-13. He discussed the challenge and vision, policy framework, Department's role that characterizes the implementation of the programs, and goals, objectives and actions (see Clean Transportation Program Draft Strategic Plan).

  Commissioner Prakash inquired about the Department's relationships with companies such as CarShare, ZipCar, etc. Mr. Hayden reported that the City is supportive of car-share programs and helped establish City CarShare as a nonprofit organization. There has been discussion with car-share companies on ways to integrate plug-in vehicles into their fleets and be involved in the electric vehicle infrastructure once it is set up. One of the challenges to electric vehicle ownership is that condo and apartment house residents or people who do not have a garage do not have a place to plug in an electric vehicle. One answer is to encourage and increase car share pods in areas where there is a high concentration of those housing units and incorporate plug-in vehicles into car-share fleets.

  Commissioner Prakash inquired about the Department's marketing and outreach approach to consumers and stakeholders on the financial benefits of car-share programs. Mr. Hayden stated that is an area that the Department could move into, but is not equipped to do so at this time. The most aggressive outreach at this time is centered on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs. It is possible that the Clean Cities Coalition can help leverage the message in the future. Commissioner Prakash inquired about the number of electric vehicle plug-in stations located in San Francisco. Mr. Hayden stated that there are less than a dozen charge stations in place that are geared toward new technologies, but installation of new stations in public garages and City-owned properties is in progress. Commercial establishments that have retail parking lots are starting to install stations as well.

  Commissioner Gravanis suggested that the Strategic Plan include a goal to reduce car ownership by utilizing car share programs. Mr. Hayden stated that people are far less inclined to purchase a vehicle if they know that a car share program is available. Commissioner Gravanis stated that the plan should also acknowledge the carbon footprint in the manufacturing and delivery of cars as well as the materials and energy required to produce them. She stated that there are other environmental issues involved in reducing car ownership in addition to clean air and green house gas reductions.

  Commissioner Wald suggested including metrics into the Strategic Plan. Example: expanding emergency ride programs. How many businesses are currently enrolled in the program and what a reasonable goal for the coming year should be? Include a definition of what expand means in order to have a sense of what it is we are trying to achieve. Another example would be to measure progress from days that people are not supposed to get in their car, e.g. Walk SF, Sunday Streets. Mr. Hayden stated that some metrics are achievable now and others can be developed.

  Commissioner Wald suggested including goals in connection with the America's Cup so that there is alternative transportation available to the event in place of single-passenger vehicles, e.g. setting up buses, trains, and car pools to transport people to the event and parking lots/garages outside of the city. Then measure the progress in order to give people a sense that it can be done. Mr. Hayden stated that these types of recommendations have been made to the America's Cup

Planning Committee, e.g., bike pods, car share. Director Nutter reported that proposals, timelines and budgets are currently being submitted to the Event Committee so that they can review their priorities and determine what can be funded.

Commissioner Prakash inquired about the level of communication between departments in order to make substantive changes to city infrastructure so that environmental objectives can be achieved. Director Nutter reported that there has been some coordination and more needs to be done. The Municipal Transportation Authority has innovative project plans and visions on how to inspire people to use alternate methods of transportation and get people out of their cars. She reported on her meeting with the Deputy Mayor of Vienna and the Deputy Director of the Municipal Transportation Authority on this topic. A department director meeting is planned to discuss department coordination at the program level. Commissioner Wald discussed the concept of linking departments and programs for this purpose.

Public Comment

Ms. Lurilla Harris stated that there is a large population of handicapped people in San Francisco and inquired whether consideration has been given to making accessible vehicles available so that they can continue driving rather than be victims of paratransit. She expressed her concern with the level of service provided by vans that are contracted out by MUNI.

Ms. Miriam Gordon inquired why there is a shortage of MUNI passes for people with commuter checks. Ms. Canez responded that in April, the Muni fast pass is only going to be available on the Clipper Card and so the physical paper passes will not be available. Now what you can do is take your commuter check and a Clipper Card and go to a retail vendor (Walgreens) to add the pass electronically onto your card. For more information on retail vendors you can go to clippercard.com. SFMTA is the agency responsible for the passes and the Muni transit service so any direct questions about passes and availability should be directed to them. Ms. Singa added that since the passes are electronic now, there will not be a shortage. Ms. Harris stated that there should be more publicity on where you can add money to the Clipper Card.

- **Department Wide Priorities & Initiatives.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director. Department Wide Priorities and Initiatives was continued to the March 14, 2011 Policy Committee meeting.

5. **Update on the Treasure Island Draft Sustainability Plan.** (Discussion) (Explanatory Documents: Executive Summary to the Policy Committee, Link to the current draft Sustainability Plan http://sftreasureisland.org/index.aspx?page=254; Citizens Advisory Board Staff Report; List of TICD Obligations; Green Building Specs for LEED ND, Presentation) Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter; Speakers: Michael Tymoff Deputy Director, Treasure Island Redevelopment Project, Mayors Office of Economic and Workforce Development (MOWED), Jean Rodgers Principal ARUP, Kheay Loke, Project Manager TICD

Mr. Michael Tymoff introduced himself and the project team consisting of Ms. Jean Rogers, Principal ARUP, Mr. Kheay Loke, Project Manager, TICD; Mr. Jack Robertson and Mr. Stephen Proud of Lennar. Mr. Tymoff provided an informational presentation on the Draft Sustainability Plan for the Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Project (see Executive Summary to the Policy Committee). He stated that the Sustainability Plan, as updated from the 2006 Plan, is a policy document that would be adopted by Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) at the time of final project approvals and would be a flexible plan that would allow for updates throughout the course of the project. He discussed changes from the 2006 plan to the current reiteration of the Plan.

Mr. Kheay Loke reported on all positive aspects of the 2006 and recent reiteration of the plan that is in accordance with the Department of the Environment's program goals. It takes into account an environmentally sustainable approach toward climate change, transportation, walk-ability, energy efficiency/renewable energy, site design and land, water, waste, community, green building and neighborhood design standards and many other sustainable practices.

Ms. Jean Rogers presented on the 2011 Sustainability Plan discussing the comprehensive vision for sustainability, what's changed in the world from 2006-11, and what's changed in the Plan to include changes in local and state regulations, advances in green technology (rising energy standards and new incentives and developments for green technology), and evolution of the project. A presentation was given on the Sustainability Plan on topics of community, transportation, integrated sustainable design (energy, water and waste), climate change and resilience, and economic viability. Each chapter of the Sustainability Plan includes objectives, strategies, targets and benefits for each focus area (see Sustainability at-a-Glance slide). Ms. Rogers stated that TICD would be codifying environmental sustainability obligations in their Design for Development Agreement in the areas of land use, transportation and infrastructure, energy and water, and community benefits. Presentation topics are outlined in the presentation explanatory document.

Commissioner Gravanis provided the following suggestions to the Sustainability Plan:

- Habitat Management Plan and Biodiversity. (1) To the biodiversity reference in the plan, add at least a paragraph that addresses that one of the elements of sustainability is the natural world and the non-human species, and that implementation of the biological diversity goal would include the protection and restoration of natural occurring habitat on Yerba Buena Island; (2) add other aspects of biodiversity such as bird-safe facades and Integrated Pest Management in the context of non-human species; (3) specify what components of habitat management will be protected; and (4) the last Draft Habitat Management Plan only dealt with terrestrial habitats. Include other aspects of biological resources such as, aquatic and inter-tidal habitats, and eel-grass beds.
- Behavior Change. Add a discussion of future tenant behavior, management of pets, individuals' night lighting, and not feeding wildlife.
- Parking ratios. Provide education to reduce parking and car ownership. The fewer cars there are, the cheaper the housing is, because there would be less need to build parking accommodations, and there would be more real estate available for public benefits as well as other revenue-generating activities.
- Ground Mounted Solar Panels. Solar panels should not use up open space; they should go on every roof and wall as much as possible.
- Driving. Add under TICD sustainability obligations under land use, to lessen or eliminate the need for driving.
- Urban Agricultural Park. How much of that park will be used for community gardens for individuals to use? Provide a lot of space for people to do their own gardening as opposed to only revenue producing and or educational facilities.
- Remediation work. There is discussion about how developers will continue to clean up beyond what the Navy will do. Will institutional controls be avoided that have been talked about in the past? Make sure that community gardens are going to be clean enough so people can grow produce. More information is required on the cleanup.
- Term usage. Use the term climate appropriate, not drought-tolerant plantings.
- CEQA Requirements. Protection of sensitive species is all that CEQA requires, but more should be done to not only protect sensitive species, but entire habitats.
- Car sharing. Add promotion of mandatory car-sharing in larger residential and commercial projects.

- Transit Pass. Change wording to state that a transit pass will be included in the Home Owners Association fee.
- Rental Housing. Provide for the needs of San Franciscans of all income levels who want to rent instead of buy.

Commissioner Wald expressed her concern that decisions are going to have to be made about what strategies are to be employed, and she is unclear as to when those decisions will be made and how and when they will be communicated so it is known what they are, and a determination can be made as to whether they have been done or not.

Mr. Tymoff offered to share the scheduled performance that is attached to the Design for Development Agreement (DDA) and the phasing diagram. He explained that the agreement that the City and TIDA have with TICD is that they prepare all of the infrastructure and the land for development, and in exchange they have the right to sell that land to home builders for development. A major phase application will be submitted to TIDA and City agencies to review the infrastructure. When they are ready to construct, they will submit a greater level of detail of design drawings for a sub-phase, which is typically about a block, that will include the adjacent parks and open space and all the public right of ways that will have to be provided, outside completion dates for all of those parks and open space, and the ancillary public benefits. Included with that is a contribution or subsidy for affordable housing that would be paid to TIDA. There is a clear mechanism by which the community facilities, subsidies for affordable housing, parks and open space, maintenance, transportation operating subsidy payments have to be made by the developer to TIDA. If they do not make those and fail to deliver their other obligations, they would be in default of the DDA.

Commissioner Wald stated that those are the specific terms in this Plan that had been put in a legally binding document. She stated that she does not understand the relationship between the legally binding document and the Sustainability Plan. Mr. Tymoff stated that there a number of components of the plan that were analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the ground mounted solar for example, so that when it is known who the power provider will be and when certain third parties would come to the table, there would be flexibility to implement that project. When that happens will be based on when it makes sense in terms of the build-out of the project, and it is known how many residents are there and what the rate base is.

Mr. Tymoff stated that with respect to the wastewater treatment plant, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (PUC) will construct and operate that plant, so they will make determinations on how the sludge will be used. Three different wetland scenarios have been covered in the EIR for treatment of wastewater and wetland pond applications. The PUC would determine the appropriate technologies for that. Other components such as a district and heating cooling plant will be provided by a third party. There will have to be technical and economic feasibility analyses done to understand the appropriate technology for mixed uses, and when it will be possible to amortize costs based on the rate structure and the size of the resident base. Somebody will not come in and build the district heating and cooling plant day one, there will be a critical trigger that TIDA will make decisions on. Mr. Tymoff stated that he would be happy to provide status reports back to the Department of the Environment at that time. There will be work with MTA, PUC, and various service providers to make these decisions in the future.

Commissioner Wald stated it would be useful to have some kind of document such as a matrix that shows who makes these decisions and when and how they will be made. Some decisions will be made by the PUC, others by TIDA, and the document and the plan would constrain the choices.

Director Nutter inquired about the timeline and when decisions would be made, specifically for the automated waste management system and district heating and cooling. She suggested that the

Department and Commission prioritize what some of those projects are in order to be able to engage at that point. For these particular projects because of their implications of uses throughout the city in other venues, the Department of the Environment would want to be a partner to help think through whether it would work for Treasure Island and offer their expertise on the pros and cons and how to leverage the projects throughout the city. It would be a way for the Department of the Environment to provide priority documents at the point projects are initiated.

Director Nutter suggested adding to the Plan (1) that there would be compliance with the Construction and Demolition Ordinance that the City passed because there will be so much construction and demolition as a part of this project; and (2) a discussion about the Commercial Green Building Ordinance that recently passed the Board last week that will mandate that all commercial buildings in San Francisco 10,000 square feet or over are required to do energy benchmarking and share that information through Energy Star and a web tool that we will have locally, as well as have an energy audit within the next three years.

Public Comment: Ms. Harris stated that the reference in the transportation slide that states there will be a 15-minute walking radius to a transit hub only applies to people who are not handicapped. She asked whether an accommodation would be made for the handicapped. Mr. Tymoff stated that there will be a free island shuttle that will stop in all the neighborhoods, two on Treasure Island, and two on Yerba Buena Island. He stated that Treasure Island has a flat landscape.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired as to when comments would need to be incorporated into the Plan. Mr. Tymoff stated that comments should be provided by March 1. All the final documents are scheduled to be submitted for recommendation to the Citizens Advisory Board on March 29 and the TIDA Board on April 7. He reported that Department of the Environment staff comments have been received.

6. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

   Director Nutter reported that (1) the landfill agreement was at the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee last week and was continued for two months; (2) No action was taken at a hearing today at the Board of Supervisors on the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Recycling Center (HANC); and (3) a press conference was held on the implementation of Global Tap at the San Francisco Airport.

7. **Announcements.** (Discussion) There were no announcements made at this time.

8. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion) Commissioner Wald on the recommendation of Commissioner Prakash requested a presentation at the March 14 meeting on new legislation proposed by the Board of Supervisors President David Chiu on Yellow Pages distribution and handbills. The project sponsor, representatives from the business community and Department staff would be invited to present on this proposal. Department staff would be asked to discuss energy and material savings. Mr. Westlund, Program Outreach Manager, reported that this issue is currently at the Board of Supervisors under the 30-day rule. Additional agenda items suggested for the March 14 meeting include (1) an update on the Heron's Head Eco Center; (2) staff report or written summary on Global Tap and eliminating single-serve water bottles at City events; (3) Department-wide Priorities and Initiatives Draft Strategic Plan; (4) San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority Climate Action Strategy report; and (5) America's Cup.

9. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

10. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary, Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 14, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

Approved: April 18, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

MAR - 7 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2011, 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL, ROOM 421
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

03-07-11P01:16 EDL

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public comment will be taken before the Committee takes action on any item.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.**
2. **Approval of Minutes of the February 14, 2011 Policy Committee Rescheduled Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: February 14, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)
3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
4. **San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA) Presentation on the San Francisco Transportation Sector Climate Action Strategy.** The Committee will receive and endorse receipt of SFMTA's Draft 2011 Climate Action Strategy for San Francisco's transportation sector for recommendation to the Commission on the Environment. Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald; Speakers: Calla Ostrander, Department of the Environment Climate Action Coordinator (5 minutes) and Peter Brown, Project Manager, SFMTA Sustainable Streets Division (30 minutes) (Explanatory Document: Draft 2011 Climate Action Strategy) (Discussion and Action)
5. **America's Cup Sustainability Plan Guiding Principles and Focus Areas.** Sponsors: Commissioners Johanna Wald and Ruth Gravanis; Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (5 minutes) (Discussion)
6. **Draft Strategic Plan Presentation on Department Wide Priorities & Initiatives.** Sponsor/Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (15 minutes) (Explanatory Document: Draft Strategic Plan) (Informational Presentation and Discussion)
7. **Global Tap Program Status Update – Staff Written Report.** Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald (Explanatory Document: Global Tap Status Written Report) (Informational Report and Discussion)
8. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)
9. **Announcements.** (Discussion)
10. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)
11. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
12. **Adjournment.**

onica Fish, Commission Secretary, Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 11, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee , or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org within three business days of a meeting. If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Commission Policy Committee after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Department of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 during normal office hours or will be made available at the Policy Committee meeting website link https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee as attachments included with the agenda or meeting minutes.

Important Information

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the Committee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Committee members. Any written comments should be sent to: Commission Secretary of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Comments which cannot be delivered to the Commission Secretary by that time may be taken directly to the hearing at the location above. When bringing handouts to meetings, please photocopy on both sides of the paper and try to use post-consumer recycled or tree-free paper. Also, please bring sufficient copies of handouts for the Committee, the Commission Secretary and the public.

Public Comment

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but are not on today's agenda. Public comment will be taken following each agendized item. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes, unless otherwise announced by the Chair. If it is demonstrated that the comments by the public will exceed 15 minutes, the Chair may continue Public Comment to another time during the meeting.

The Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue not appearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In response to public comment, not on an agendized item, the Committee is limited to:

1. Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
2. Request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
3. Directing staff to place the item or issue on a future agenda (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Disability Access

The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meeting will be held at City Hall, Room 421, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, in the Civic Center area. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the Civic Center Station at United Nations Plaza and Market Street. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro Stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For information about MUNI accessible services call (415) 923-6142. There is accessible curbside parking adjacent to City Hall on Grove Street and Van Ness Avenue and in the vicinity of the Veterans Building at 401 Van Ness Avenue adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Monica Fish at (415) 355-3709 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call the Mayor's Office on Disability at (415) 554-6789 or (415) 554-6799 (TTY) for further information.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance
(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Sunshine Task Force Administrator, City Hall, Room 409, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683 at Phone No.: (415) 554-7724; Fax No.: (415) 554-7854; E-mail: sotf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3112; web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

SF Environment

Our home. Our city. Our planet.

A Department of the City and County of San Francisco

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

Melanie Nutter
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

NOTICE OF CANCELLED MEETING
MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2011, 5:00 p.m.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

The Monday, March 14, 2011, 5:00 p.m. meeting of the Commission on the Environment Policy Committee has been CANCELLED due to a lack of quorum. The next regularly scheduled meeting is on Monday, April 11, 2011, 5:00 p.m. at City Hall, Room 421. Please contact the Commission Secretary, Monica Fish, at 415-355-3709 or Monica.Fish@sfgov.org if you would like to be placed on the agenda mailing list for future meetings. An agenda may also be accessed on the Commission website at https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/environment-commission.

Posted: March 14, 2011

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

MAR 14 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

SF Environment

Our home. Our city. Our planet.

A Department of the City and County of San Francisco

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

Melanie Nutter
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

RESCHEDULED MEETING NOTICE FOR REGULAR MEETING OF MONDAY, APRIL 11, 2011, 5:00 p.m. to MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2011, 5:00 p.m.

04-01-11A10:17 RCVD

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS DEPT

APR - 1 2011

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

Department of the Environment Eco Center
11 Grove Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

The **MONDAY, APRIL 11, 2011, 5:00 p.m.** regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission on the Environment's Policy Committee that regularly meets at City Hall, Room 421, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA has been **RESCHEDULED to MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2011, at 5:00 p.m.** The meeting will be held at the Department of the Environment Eco Center, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102. An agenda will be provided at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Please contact the Department of the Environment Commission Secretary, Monica Fish, at 415-355-3709 or Monica.Fish@sfgov.org if you would like to be placed on the agenda mailing list or for additional information. An agenda may also be accessed on the Policy Committee website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee.

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
Commission on the Environment
(415) 355-3709

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

04-12-11 AUG:25 RCVD

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

APR 12 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

71

111
Rescheduled

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULED MEETING AND AGENDA
***MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2011, 5:00 P.M.**

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT ECO CENTER
11 GROVE STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

The Regular Meeting of the Commission on the Environment Policy Committee that regularly meets at ity Hall, Room 421, has been RESCHEDULED to Monday, April 18, 2011 and will be held at the epartment of the Environment Eco Center, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA .

OMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS
Public comment will be taken before the Committee takes action on any item.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.**
2. **Approval of Minutes of the February 14, 2011 Policy Committee Rescheduled Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: February 14, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)
3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
4. **GreenFinance SF Program Update.** Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald; Speaker: Richard Chien, Private Sector Green Building Coordinator, GreenFinanceSF Program Manager (10 minutes) (Informational Report and Discussion)
5. **America's Cup Sustainability Plan Guiding Principles and Focus Areas.** Sponsors: Commissioners Johanna Wald and Ruth Gravanis; Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (5 minutes) (Discussion)
6. **Process for Issuing Environmental Pioneer Rewards.** Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald (Discussion)
7. **Global Tap Program Status Update – Staff Written Report.** Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald (Explanatory Document: Global Tap Status Written Report) (Informational Report and Discussion)
8. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)
9. **Announcements.** (Discussion)
10. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)

11. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
12. **Adjournment.**

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary, Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 9, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee , or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org within three business days of a meeting. If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Commission Policy Committee after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Department of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 during normal office hours or will be made available at the Policy Committee meeting website link https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee as attachments included with the agenda or meeting minutes.

Important Information

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the Committee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Committee members. Any written comments should be sent to: Commission Secretary of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Comments which cannot be delivered to the Commission Secretary by that time may be taken directly to the hearing at the location above. When bringing handouts to meetings, please photocopy on both sides of the paper and try to use post-consumer recycled or tree-free paper. Also, please bring sufficient copies of handouts for the Committee, the Commission Secretary and the public.

Public Comment

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but are not on today's agenda. Public comment will be taken following each agendized item. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes, unless otherwise announced by the Chair. If it is demonstrated that the comments by the public will exceed 15 minutes, the Chair may continue Public Comment to another time during the meeting.

The Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue not appearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In response to public comment, not on an agendized item, the Committee is limited to:

1. Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
2. Request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
3. Directing staff to place the item or issue on a future agenda (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Disability Access

The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meeting will be held at City Hall, Room 421, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, in the Civic Center area. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the Civic Center Station at United Nations Plaza and Market Street. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro Stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For information about MUNI accessible services call (415) 923-6142. There is accessible curbside parking adjacent to City Hall on Grove Street and Van Ness Avenue and in the vicinity of the Veterans Building at 401 Van Ness Avenue adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Monica Fish at (415) 355-3709 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call the Mayor's Office on Disability at (415) 554-6789 or (415) 554-6799 (TTY) for further information.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance
(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Sunshine Task Force Administrator, City Hall, Room 409, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683 at Phone No.: (415) 554-7724; Fax No.: (415) 554-7854; E-mail: sotf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3112; web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Posted: April 11, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

MAY - 2 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

*RESCHEDULED MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2011, 5:00 P.M.
DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT ECO CENTER
11 GROVE STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

The Regular Meeting of the Commission on the Environment Policy Committee that regularly neets at City Hall, Room 421, has been RESCHEDULED to Monday, April 18, 2011 and will be eld at the Department of the Environment Eco Center, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA .

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), ahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:00 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Excused: Commissioner Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the February 14, 2011 Policy Committee Rescheduled Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: February 14, 2011 Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the February 14, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash).

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

4. **GreenFinance SF Program Update.** Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald; Speaker: Richard Chien, Private Sector Green Building Coordinator, GreenFinanceSF Program Manager (Explanatory Document: GreenFinance SF Commercial Program) (Informational Report and Discussion)

Mr. Chien provided an informational report on San Francisco's PACE program (GreenFinance SF) that was established in order to provide homeowners with financing to install green renovation projects on private buildings. The City created a special clean energy financing district through Mello-Roos law that enables the sale of bonds to provide the upfront financing for clean energy improvements on private properties. Repayment would be secured by a senior tax lien assessed by the City and County local government and recollected through the property tax billing process until the principal and interest was paid for. It was an effective way to spread high up front costs over a longer period of time and address challenges to securing capital for these types of projects. The cost would be transferable to a new property owner as long as that benefit was still being paid for by the special tax.

San Francisco launched its residential program with great support from the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor. There was a lot of outreach to target residential homeowners in San Francisco to make them aware of the program. There was a very good response from homeowners, that was determined by how many people visited the website, how many applications were started, feedback from contractors, and the number of people who requested financing. Three weeks after the program was launched on April 12, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac released letters to their lenders saying they were uncomfortable with these programs. A couple of months later, the Federal Housing Financing Agency that was created by Congress to oversee Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, released a definitive statement that these programs posed "safety and soundness" concerns to the mortgage industry. The liens created by these types of locally administered programs automatically go in front of the mortgage, so in case there is a foreclosure or default process, the senior lien would have to be paid off first. The fact that these assessments were minimal compared to the amount that people were borrowing for their mortgages and that the improvements would be adding value to the property, saving energy, and creating jobs got lost in that argument. The program had to be discontinued as a result.

Mr. Chien explained that there was over $30 million dollars that was being administered through the California Energy Commission to support residential PACE programs that needed to find a new purpose in light of what happened. The focus now is to promote home-energy efficiency through a website and provide outreach and communication along with local governments and contractors about a financial clearinghouse that would be available to homeowners and would offer more traditional unsecured loan products. These would be pre-approved by the State Treasurer's Office. In addition, there is some money from the original $33 million to

continue PACE in light of those Federal Housing Financing Agency directives. Sonoma County is continuing their residential PACE program.

Mr. Chien stated that since the commercial sector is not affected by decisions of federal housing mortgage regulators, it is in a better position to launch without regulatory obstacles. The City is receiving just under $400,000 to provide a credit enhancement for our commercial PACE program that is scheduled to launch early this summer. Work is in progress with other grantees that include Sonoma and Placer Counties to test best practices in primarily commercial PACE and primarily with the City of Los Angeles and the Clinton Climate Initiative. The Clinton Climate Initiative is providing technical assistance to the City of Los Angeles and the other grantees on this variant of commercial PACE, which uses the owner arranged PACE financing model. This means that the building owner arranges their own lender for the capital improvements, and that capital provider gets all the benefits of the senior PACE lien to secure that repayment obligation. The reserve money that is being used as grant funds would hopefully provide more cushion to potential capital providers to encourage participation.

Mr. Chien provided a written summary (see explanatory document) that provides information on the history of what happened on the residential side and what was needed to reallocate all of the grant money to the commercial sector. There is strong interest to fix the problems in establishing PACE in the residential sector. There are negotiations with the regulatory agencies that unfortunately do not appear to be advancing, and there is litigation currently in progress. Lawsuits have been filed in four federal district courts; plaintiffs include the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), the California Attorney General, counties in Florida, New York, Sonoma and Placer Counties, Palm Desert, and the Sierra Club.

Public Comment

Mr. David Pilpel inquired about the concerns surrounding the residential PACE program. Mr. Chien reported that the concern is that locally administered community benefit district financing improvements to private properties for public purpose should not be the concern of a federal mortgage regulator, and that it is completely within the bounds of local governments to operate these types of programs. Commissioner Wald stated that the intent is to make it easier for people to partake in these programs. There is congressional uncertainty, so it does not seem that legislative avenues will provide a resolution, and litigation would take a number of years.

Commissioner Wald stated that Palm Desert had effectively worked with the legislature on a program that was designed to encourage people to put solar on roofs. Mr. Chien reported that Palm Desert supported the passage of 2008 Assembly Bill (AB) 811 that took the idea of property assessed clean energy financing and made it essentially available to all jurisdictions in California. San Francisco and Berkeley being charter

cities could do things that other governments were not as freely able to do. AB 811 clarified that all local governments can run these programs provided the legislative body authorizes it.

Commissioner Wald spoke in support of transferring the PACE program from the residential to the commercial sector. She asked if there was anything that could be done to facilitate solar development on homes, such as encouraging neighborhoods or blocks to bundle and deal with providers in ways that would significantly reduce their costs. Mr. Chien stated that the neighborhood or block approach is being actively pursued by groups such as "One Block off the Grid" that works nationally with solar developers and providers to engage city neighborhoods or blocks that have an interest in doing solar. They take a bulk purchasing approach to engaging with homeowners in a target submarket. Another financing option that is becoming more widely available is a solar lease or a Power Purchase Agreement, whereby a Power Purchase Agreement provider enters into a contract with a homeowner or commercial property owner but the homeowner does not own the asset, they just pay for the electricity at or below what they would normally pay for electricity from the utility.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether the Department has thought about playing a role in educating people about opportunities in a proactive way. For example, rather than waiting for one block to show interest, to tell people about one block and encourage them to make contact, in addition to providing them with more information about available options. She stated that the PACE program had removed all of that uncertainty. Mr. Chien stated that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) money helped create and support the home energy efficiency market. What happened with PACE was debilitating to that momentum. Now the California Energy Commission and the California Public Utilities Commission are working together to do a statewide branding marketing campaign called Energy Upgrade California. It is a web portal www.EnergyupgradeCA.org that contains consumer home performance education and links to contractors, local programs, utility rebate programs, with the goal of leading the homeowner through a thought process with reasons to participate. The financing portal will be established in the next few months. Mr. Chien stated that there was quite a bit of work that needed to be done because of what happened with the Federal Housing Finance Agency. The program is now oriented in a new direction with non-PACE financing, an energy efficiency incentive web portal, commercial PACE in other jurisdictions, and there are innovative solar activities. Mr. Chien stated that consideration could be given to coordinating efforts with our renewables programs and asking for feedback on how to get the word out.

Director Nutter stated that the Community Insight Project would be launched on Earth Day and would be a way to engage with other groups in this effort. The project is focused on outreach, creating partnerships, and finding opportunities to highlight

programs that we may not even be running in order to direct interest in resources of our constituents. There are entities out there doing good work that would ultimately help support departmental goals.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether any businesses have been targeted to participate in the commercial program. Mr. Chien stated that a commercial track had been developed with business groups such as Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) for the original GreenFinanceSF program, and outreach will begin again with the most recent iteration of the commercial program. He stated that large energy-efficiency companies have been requesting a commercial program in order to acquire this kind of low-cost financing. So much energy efficiency work has already been done in San Francisco with commercial building owners, so it will be an effort to discover who out of the eligible properties are left to speak to.

Public Comment: Ms. Nunes inquired about incentives for developing green roofs on commercial and residential properties. Mr. Chien stated that there are no current incentives to promote green roof technology. He stated that the City does have strict building requirements for new buildings, and installing a green roof would be a way to help meet these requirements for any particular class of buildings that are being built. Doing a green roof on a new construction project is much easier than on a retrofit. There are structural issues and other issues that become more significant when you are doing a retrofit. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is working aggressively on a citywide approach to managing City stormwater runoff, which includes a green roof component. Mr. Chien stated that because of our mild climate that does not receive a lot of rainfall compared to other jurisdictions, the overall cost of promoting a green roof technology would not be cost effective from a city programmatic perspective. An installation has been done on a City owned office building at One South Van Ness, so the technology is supported, but is not getting any specific financial incentives at this point.

Commissioner Wald inquired about white roofs. Mr. Chien stated that cool roofs are required under the new California Energy Code for commercial buildings in a re-roofing situation or new construction. The climate is so mild here, that some of these technologies are not considered to be very cost effective.

Mr. Pilpel reported that there were three roofs east of 3rd Street near Candlestick that had solar, but there was a block that didn't have it and could use it. He agrees with the idea of working block by block or in certain neighborhoods where you have a consistent roof type. He suggested talking to people about the program in areas where it would make sense. Mr. Pilpel suggested that Director Nutter promote these programs in her discussions with neighborhood groups, especially those located on the west side where they are generally not as supportive of some of the things that the Department of the Environment does as they could be. This is an opportunity to

promote programs that are financed in addition to other Department programs such as zero waste, transportation, toxics reduction.

Commissioner Gravanis discussed the importance of encouraging residential homeowners to consider installing some form of renewable energy. For some people, the incentive would be the belief that sometime in the future, they might be able to sell some of that energy to the grid. Along those lines, she has not been able to find anything in writing that PG&E's new smart meters are capable of measuring electrical flow in two directions and is awaiting a response from PG&E.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired about the timeframe for the feed-in tariff that has been discussed. Mr. Chien stated that he does not know when a decision will be made. There is a national group with a presence in California and other high opportunity states that is trying to engage with the business community to get political support to take it to the level of the legislature. They want to build grassroots support for this effort first so there is enough political will behind it.

Public Comment: Mr. Davis stated that his understanding is that current laws or the way that it is set up allows you to sell back to PG&E up to how much you use. He asked if there has been any discussion about changing the process. Mr. Chien stated that a feed-in tariff sets the price for electricity generation regardless of where it is coming from. If you have a solar system on your house, you would get at a rate of what you are producing. Mr. Davis asked if that would be across the board in California. Mr. Chien stated that that utilities, regulators and other agencies are working together to develop a better pricing strategy and address other structural issues to make these programs work better. Mr. Davis inquired if this action could turn California into an exporting energy source. Mr. Chien stated that it would provide an incentive for businesses and owners to become power providers if they knew they would be getting paid for it.

Mr. Chien stated that he would provide an update on the commercial program in June – August.

5. **America's Cup Sustainability Plan Guiding Principles and Focus Areas.** Sponsors: Commissioners Johanna Wald and Ruth Gravanis; Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (5 minutes) (Discussion)

Director Nutter provided an update on discussions held between the City, the America's Cup Event Authority and Organizing Committee on a Sustainability Plan for the America's Cup event to be held throughout the summer of 2012 as well as in 2013. The America's Cup Organizing Committee helps with fundraising for the Event Authority, and the Event Authority is the entity that is responsible for the host agreement and for the execution of the event.

The Department of the Environment initiated the Sustainability Plan with the Mayor's Office, the Event Authority, and the Organizing Committee as a way to create an umbrella document that pulls together all of the sustainability elements for America's Cup. Some of these elements are mandated in the host agreement, and some are San Francisco's mandates and laws. There are also elements of the Sustainability Plan that are aspirational, ambitious goals that the Department of the Environment and other entities envisioned for America's Cup. All proposals that the Department of Environment has made have not yet been approved by the Event Authority or Organizing Committee and are currently being discussed. After meeting for two months, a Draft Sustainability Plan was scoped out in the following focus areas:

- Carbon Footprint. What is the carbon footprint of the event? In the host agreement, it says that America's Cup will be carbon neutral. The Department is interested in exploring how to make America's Cup a climate positive event, which means going beyond being carbon neutral. There will be a focus on not only offsetting one-for-one carbon impact with mitigation, but finding funding for long-term infrastructure that would continue to provide carbon benefits to San Francisco after America's Cup events have been completed. This is something that the Clinton Climate Initiative has been championing.

- Carbon Offset Program. Are there opportunities to bring local funds to America's Cup through a carbon offset program? The Department of the Environment started a carbon offset fund a couple of years ago as a way to direct local offset funds back to local projects. We see this as a possible vehicle to use nationally and internationally to offset carbon as well as redirect funds back to local projects. There are many questions regarding verifiability and what third-party entity we may work with to provide that verifiability, as well as what those projects would be. Right now we are looking at expanding that vehicle as one of, if not the only, offset tool for people that are traveling here for America's Cup.

- Transportation Element. The Transportation Element is covered in a separate plan called *The People Plan* currently posted online at the Office of Economic and Workforce Development website. It was created mostly by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA) with input from the Department's Clean Transportation Team. The elements that the Department focused on in the Plan are (1) electric vehicles and if and when it would be appropriate to install charging stations at far off parking pods, and (2) supporting every opportunity to get people out of their cars by supporting expanded transit service, e.g. creating bike-sharing opportunities, etc.

- The LEED Plan, the building design element for existing and new buildings. The Department is responsible for writing the plan for this event. It will codify all of the rules, laws, and mandates around existing and newly constructed buildings and how they will be managed. It will integrate all of San Francisco's Green Building

Standards and find opportunities to go above and beyond those mandates to show that America's Cup can exceed our existing laws and mandates on green building.

- Waste Management. Mr. Alex Dmitriew of the Department of the Environment's Zero Waste Team reported that the Zero Waste Team presented a Waste Management Plan to the America's Cup Event Authority on March 31st. The document is called the Waste Management Plan because it is referenced as such in the host agreement, but a request will be made to change it to the Zero Waste Plan. He stated that there is an excellent opportunity to make this event a zero waste event, and the plan describes what sustainability is in terms of zero waste. To help the Event Authority understand the environment we have in San Francisco, th plan references Ordinances that will impact the operations of the America's Cup, e.g., the Mandatory Composting and Recycling Ordinance, the Construction and Demolition Debris Ordinance, and the Food Service Waste Ordinance. It specifies that there should be compliance through the permit process for street events, and that event organizers produce a plan on how they will recycle materials from specific events. There is also a Plastic Bag Ordinance ban that won't directly appl to event vendors, but discussions have been held about legislatively expanding th scope of the Ordinance to additional retail establishments.

  A statement is being made that part of the zero waste concept is to hold a plastic free event that will be tied into the impacts that plastic has on the marine environment. Commissioner Wald stressed the importance of not having single-serve water bottles available. Mr. Dmitriew stated that a Global Tap solution would be requested. Conversations will also be held with souvenir vendors and banner producers about the importance of not supplying plastic bags.

  The Waste Management Plan deals with the reality that we are going to have materials produced at events. Events will be held all over the City, primarily on the waterfront. The Department was tasked with producing estimates of material that would be generated from these events and has put together a policy framework. It has procured the services of Environmental Science Associates (ESA) to help put together the document. There will be many factors to consider. Not only will the event have spectator events, but the event will also have support facilities and the village being constructed that will contribute to the construction and demolition component. There is an unknown capacity for spectator vessels, such as private yachts, and temporary piers will be constructed. Estimates have been provided to Recology who is now working with the Department and ESA to determine the most cost-effective approach. The Waste Management Plan was favorably received by City agencies, and staff will be waiting for comments from the public. Director Nutter thanked Mr. Dmitriew and the Zero Waste Team on their work on the Plan.

- Clean Tech. Harnessing partnerships with clean tech companies would help ensure that renewables are a critical part of America's Cup. Clean tech was added as a way to integrate renewables into the America's Cup event by finding sponsorship opportunities with local clean tech companies. It is a way for local companies to showcase new and innovative technologies that could be helpful in meeting America's Cup sustainability goals at reducing carbon and offsetting diesel power generators. The Department will be convening clean tech companies and discussing opportunities to partner with America's Cup this summer.

- Integrating Local Food Policy. A discussion was held on how to raise awareness about sustainable organic food, specifically sustainable local seafood, in order to ensure that vendors are following strict policies and highlighting restaurants that follow sustainable food practices.

- Outreach and Education regarding the bay and our estuaries. America's Cup is funding a global entity called One World Oceans to raise awareness about oceans in a global sense. Discussions are being held to ensure that education and outreach is not only about the Pacific gyre and oceans generally, but specifically addresses the characteristics of our bay, our waterways, our estuaries, and the restoration that we would like to see locally as well as the health of the bay.

Director Nutter discussed the process moving forward. She explained that the Sustainability Plan does not yet contain budget numbers or an implementation timeline and has not been benchmarked against other large events with sustainability plans in a comprehensive way. The Event Authority and Organizing Committee authorized the Department to hire a consultant to help us take the Sustainability Plan to the next level. The scope of work to be included in that plan will be distributed to some of our contractors this week and includes benchmarking our plan to other big sporting events like Vancouver 2010, London 2012, and other sustainability plans as well as other America's Cups. This will provide context to what is happening in other event areas and generate new ideas for what is not currently in the plan. The consultant has been asked to spell out legal requirements, host committee commitments and aspirational goals. When the Sustainability Plan is fleshed out and implementation timeline and budget numbers are completed, we'll be better able to demonstrate the possibility of including bold elements that take us a step farther than San Francisco mandates and are economically achievable.

Director Nutter stated that the consultant will be developing measurements and metrics for success, identifying a timeline and budget for each area, identifying roles and responsibilities, and proposing a draft plan for review in early June. The reason this plan is so critical is because resources have not yet been committed for sustainability for America's Cup. The event agreement identified approximately $32 million related to transportation and other elements, but has not identified funding for the Sustainability Element. This document will show that not only are these things

achievable, but will give some reality to the money that will have to be raised to implement comprehensive sustainability strategies for America's Cup.

Commissioner Gravanis asked who would be hiring the consultant. Director Nutter stated that the Department of the Environment would be doing the hiring, but that the Event Authority and the Organizing Committee would be raising the money to pay for the proposal as well as participating in the process. The Department will be identifying the existing contractor and overseeing the scope of work and the Draft Sustainability Plan that will be distributed this week. Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether the Sustainability Plan would be placed on a website for public response. Director Nutter stated that it would be posted, but not for several months.

Commissioner Gravanis commended the Waste Management Plan that lays out the mandates and provides background. She suggested that (1) stronger language be used to require that mandates be followed instead of merely encouraged or recommended; (2) that fines be issued for non-compliance; and (3) to identify an entity that would be communicating with vendors on the "no single-serve water bottles should be sold" message. She inquired who would be in charge of contracts and lease agreements.

Mr. Dmitriew stated that the Waste Management Plan strongly states that a Zero Waste Coordinator should be hired to perform zero waste goals. The Department will supply the technical data, educate people on choices, make service suggestions, and do the signage, but ultimately it is up to the vendors to comply. The only way to enforce mandates is contractually with the Event Authority and its vendors as well as event organizers who are very much part of this system. Commissioner Wald stated that standard contract terms for compliance are needed so there is a vehicle for the Zero Waste Coordinator. The Coordinator has to be there when the contract forms are drawn up and have the authority to do whatever is needed to determine whether those contract terms are complied with. However, they can't be responsible to make sure that every contract says the right things. There has to be standard terms for different activities and all activities have to be identified.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether the America's Cup Organizing Committee and America's Cup Event Authority would contract with a master event organizer who would then be responsible for writing all of these specifics based on our City laws. Mr. Dmitriew stated that the event organizer would also be working with Department staff to provide technical information.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether there have been conversations with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) about bringing water lines to the main spectator sites to make either permanent or temporary jug fillers available. Director Nutter reported that SFPUC has not been present at the meetings she has attended and will have to be consulted. There has been discussion with the Event Authority and

other City agencies about no single-serve water bottles and a global tap or similar operation solution, which has been integrated into the Sustainability Plan. She explained that there are many different teams meeting at different times, and it may be that SFPUC has been involved in other discussions.

Commissioner Gravanis suggested estimating the amount of water that spectators are expected to drink and the number of locations where jug fillers should be installed. She suggested that an estimate be made for the number of port-a-potties that should be made available as well. It would be appropriate for the organizer to issue a request for a company or multiple companies to bid on the job. Director Nutter stated that opportunities for Requests for Proposals should be identified for other elements of sustainability services.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that one of the Department of the Environment's main roles in the People Plan appeared to relate to electric cars and charging stations. The America's Cup Environment Council does not want to see a lot of our staff resources devoted to this effort because the focus should be to get people out of cars. It is a significant mixed message that if you are rich enough to buy an electric car, then it is okay for you to drive. More attention should be given to alternatives such as making bike rental facilities available at all transit hubs in order to make it easier for people to leave their cars at home. Director Nutter stated that the feedback from the America's Cup Environment Council has helped adjust the Department's focus in that area.

Commissioner Wald urged that there be an extra effort made to provide education about the principles underlying the sustainability component of this event. She stated that it is not too early to think about how to prioritize the eight components of the Sustainability Plan just in case the event organizer won't agree to all components and a trade may be possible. She endorsed Commissioner Gravanis's comments about strengthening the language and issuing fines for violations so people are held accountable. It should be made clear that San Francisco will do a report card on this event and will tell the world how sustainable it is even if we are disappointed. Measuring success needs to be a major part of the effort so that when future events are planned, the benchmarking exercise is based on real data. Director Nutter stated that the Event Authority has an interest in creating this event as a model. Metrics for success are needed for the City to be able to evaluate and share publicly, so whatever claims that are made following the event can be backed up with real data.

Public Comment

Ms. Lurilla Harris discussed the difficulty that handicapped persons may have taking public transportation to the event and asked that consideration be given to the potential impacts of not having charging stations on handicapped persons.

Mr. David Pilpel stated that Mr. Mike Martin, prior to his current assignment, worked at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, so he would presumably have knowledge about the wastewater and water component. He confirmed that the Waste Management Plan has been published and is available for public review on the Office of Economic and Workforce Development website. Mr. Pilpel inquired whether the eight sustainability elements have been committed to in writing. Director Nutter reported that the document would be published potentially tomorrow. He asked that the document as it evolves be made available to the public at each juncture and at future meetings when this topic is being discussed in order to encourage public comment.

Commissioner Wald stated that there is expertise available for input from Natural Resources Defense Council, which has invested substantial resources into greening the Oscars and NFL that might be directly relevant to this process. She discussed the vast amount of paper that will be produced at the event.

Mr. Pilpel stated that receipts containing BPA could be issued if we don't pay attention and discussed the possibility of creating labels for local food. He suggested that grocery stores also consider the practice of labeling food with a local message, so this idea can be used on an ongoing basis and not just for special events.

Mr. Michael Davis, US Pure Water, stated that US Pure Water has been working with the City and County of San Francisco for a long time helping transition from bottled water to non-bottled water, and over the last four years has saved the City and County over $700,000. US Pure Water is a mission-driven company and one of its missions is to influence people away from bottled water. He discussed his experience facilitating a lot of different events with permanent and temporary installations and offered his expertise for this event.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that NRDC is one of the member organizations in the America's Cup Environmental Council, which includes people with all kinds of expertise, such as the Baykeeper who knows a lot about water, fueling and boat traffic, and other organizations such as the Audubon Society and the Native Plant Society that are interested in making sure that our valuable habitat will not be trampled on. She stated that the Policy Committee has been reviewing the Outreach List and Survey in order to engage the environmental community, and that this event would be an excellent opportunity for the Commission to work collaboratively with the non-profit community on an issue together. Commissioner Gravanis stated that this effort has started with Director Nutter convening a meeting with City staff people and members of the America's Cup Environmental Council and hopes for it to continue.

Commissioner Wald stated that this is an opportunity to reach out to the community about a real event with real consequences, real impacts, and real opportunities for people to provide their input on what to do and suggested that the Committee

review the Commission Outreach List at its next meeting. Director Nutter suggested identifying key people in each area to provide feedback before it goes out to a consultant and a wider audience. This would accelerate the process and keep the costs down for the consultant process. Commissioner Gravanis stated that there would be people that would be happy to volunteer their time to providing input, but suggested that input be gathered early in the process, whether it is the general public or smaller group of people with specific expertise in these focus areas. Commissioner Wald stated that the America's Cup Event Authority could be the vehicle for the early review knowing that that group would be the nucleus of the group that we would be working with in the bigger and longer-term process.

Public Comment

Ms. Harris suggested having concrete questions ready before consulting with experts.

Ms. Nunes stated that she is working on a Zero Waste Plan for San Francisco State University and inquired whether any ideas or solutions have been identified on how to implement the Zero Waste Plan for the America's Cup. Mr. Dmitriew stated that it is a complex endeavor, but San Francisco is fortunate that it has the best infrastructure and base for doing a Zero Waste Plan. The Construction and Demolition Debris Ordinance specifies that any construction and demolition debris gets mixed together so it is not separated on site and has to go to a facility that is capable of processing that material and recovering a minimum of 65% of that material. The Ordinance has mandated that we identify these facilities, certify them and are comfortable that they do achieve these diversion rates. There are also excellent programs and cost incentives to contractors that get involved in separation on site so they can significantly reduce their costs.

Mr. Dmitriew stated that San Francisco has the most highly developed commercial infrastructure for organics recovery and composting. Even though this venue is complex, it will fit well into San Francisco's well-established food-collection system. We are not reinventing anything or identifying something new to deal with this particular volume. The same is true of the Food Service Waste Ordinance that bans the use of Styrofoam food containers by food-service establishments in San Francisco. It addition to that ban, it also mandates that the replacement of food-service ware items have to be either compostable or recyclable. Most of the food vendors doing business in the city are well aware of the Ordinance requirements as well as the event organizers, so it is an achievable goal

Mr. Dmitriew stated that the plastics issue will be more challenging. The Event Authority will have to agree with these requirements, and contractual language will have to be established. There is a plastic bag ban for major supermarkets and pharmacies in the city, so the notion of bringing your own bag is there, but additional

education is needed. The Waste Management Plan calls for giving preference to vendors that can sell reusable bottles and bags.

Mr. Davis stated that US Pure Water will be providing two refillable water stations at the Earth Day Celebration this Saturday. He stated that a lot of people that are going to these events, especially Earth Day, which is a more environmentally-conscious event, will come with their refillable bottles already. Mr. Davis pointed out that using compostable cups may lead to a single-use because they would be harder to carry around at an event.

Mr. Pilpel stated that this event leads to an opportunity in coordination with non-profits to educate the public on Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) principles in addition to the reuse, reduce and repair message. He stated that the Fats Oil and Grease (FOG) Ordinance will now require that certain types of businesses install grease removal devices. He suggested that America's Cup food service vendors should also install these types of grease removal devices so that trap grease is not added to the system, and food waste is sent to the green cart rather than the sewer system.

The America's Cup Sustainability Plan was continued for further discussion to the June 13, 2011 Policy Committee meeting.

6. **Process for Issuing Environmental Pioneer Rewards.** Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald (Discussion)

Commissioner Wald reported that the intent of this agenda item is to discuss if the Department of the Environment should reward environmental leaders for their commitment and performance in San Francisco and if so how. It would be another way to connect the work that the Department and Commission are doing with real people who live in the city. Director Nutter and Commissioner Gravanis pointed out that depending on the process, it could require a lot of staff time and funding. Commissioner Gravanis stated that it could be a fundable budget item because someone may want to contribute to this type of event. It would also bring visibility for people that deserve the recognition.

A discussion was held on the best way to incorporate this type of event into current programming instead of a stand-alone event that may not be cost-effective and involve a lot of staff time. Director Nutter pointed out possibilities that include issuing awards annually at the Mayor's Earth Day breakfast, the Green Business Awards in January, the newly created Blue Green Awards in June that will recognize departments that are doing well with their Climate Action Plans, or the Department's quarterly open house to raise the profile of events at the Eco Center. She suggested that the Department's Outreach team consider how to connect this type of programming with the Community Insight Project in a special fall ceremony.

Commissioner Wald stated that the process should advance our agenda and be cost-effective at the same time. She suggested spotlighting the activities of people to their neighbors so that people understand that the work of the department is not unrelated to people like them.
Director Nutter compared this process with the Neighborhood Empowerment Network (NEN) awards event that was held this past year that highlighted local community members who have contributed to their neighborhood by working on local projects. She suggested partnering with NEN on a whole new green awards section.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel stated that he supports the idea of recognizing people for their achievements, but questioned the feasibility of annual awards. He suggested including awards as part of an existing event and additionally recognizing those that merit an award in the short term so that people are not overlooked in the interim. He cited the Urban Agriculture project as an example of a project that merits an award or some sort of publicity in the short term. He suggested seeking the input of staff at the bi-weekly staff meetings and for the Department to inquire with its grantees on who they would like to spotlight.

Commissioner Wald stated that the award issued does not have to be a formal award with nominations taken. It could be an award issued on a sporadic basis and could require minimal resources. The Department of the Environment's webpage could periodically highlight the activities of an individual as a way for people to understand that the work that the Department does has real live utility and consequences.
Commissioner Gravanis suggested that staff present options to the Committee at a future meeting.

This agenda topic was continued to the Call of the Chair.

7. **Global Tap Program Status Update – Staff Written Report.** Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald (Explanatory Document: Global Tap Status Written Report) (Informational Report and Discussion)

Commissioner Wald stated that written reports are a good way of doing Commission business and should be utilized more in the future. Commissioners should provide input into the best vehicle for providing information on the topics they are interested in.
Commissioner Gravanis concurred that it is helpful to receive reports in advance of the meeting whether or not a presentation is given. It provides an opportunity for the Commissioners to frame questions and do research. She expressed her appreciation for the work that Ms. Kass has done on this program.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that she is uncomfortable with the use of the term "Global Tap" for a Department project because it is the name of a company. She suggested that the Public Utilities Commission and the Department of the Environment's naming convention be the same, e.g., the Tap Water project. She

stated that SFPUC has given Global Tap credit for donating a lot of these facilities and their work with staff, but it has not named the campaign after them. Commissioner Gravanis stated that the SFPUC website lists Global Tap's logo there along with the Department of the Environment's and a number of other entities that have been involved in this project. She wants to ensure that as the program is expanded, that other potential companies and providers are given an opportunity to offer their expertise and equipment so all resources can be taken advantage of to encourage people to drink tap water. Director Nutter offered to bring this issue to the Outreach Team to rename the campaign. Commissioner Gravanis reported that SFPUC's website name for this project is Drink SFWater. Commissioner Wald suggested SFTap as a possible naming convention.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that she would like to raise people's awareness of bringing their own refillable water bottles wherever they go. She suggested moving ahead initially on a voluntary campaign to make sure that single-serve water bottles are not provided at events held on city property and then to move forward with an Ordinance in the future if warranted. Commissioner Wald suggested that the culmination of that campaign should be at the America's Cup event. There should be outreach to people now about bringing their own refillable bottles. Commissioner Gravanis pointed out that people attending the America's Cup event are not only San Franciscans, but will be from all over the world.

Public Comment

Ms. Harris asked if furnishing stainless steel water bottles with the Department of the Environment's logo at a minimal or at cost for people who come to these huge gatherings from around the world would be in the budget. Director Nutter reported that SFWater has them and SFPUC distributes these types of bottles, but she does not think there is a large enough budget for stainless steel bottles. She explained that the Department has traditionally spent its outreach budget on canvas bags, but water bottles could be discussed. Director Nutter stated that the America's Cup Event Authority or vendors should consider paying for and distributing free commemorative America's Cup stainless steel water bottles as a way to influence people who come to the event to refill their water bottle.

Mr. Pilpel suggested that stainless steel water bottles should be sold at cost or for two dollars, which is what it would cost for a plastic water bottle.

8. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

Director Nutter highlighted policy items. She reported that the Recology landfill contract is back at the Budget and Finance Committee on Wednesday of this week. It was continued for about two months in order for the Department to look into options

such as including the Port in the solid-waste process in the short or long-term. The Department has had many discussions with the Port on this topic. Exploratory memos have been issued that included specific information about the cost of barging, which was one of the interesting topics for review; however, it was determined that there is no short-term option for Port participation into our solid waste infrastructure. The Port is not interested in testing barging of recyclables, which we thought may be a possibility due to economics. The idea of an integrated facility at the Port instead of Brisbane is an interesting long-term idea that is seven to ten years away. The Department has commissioned a study to actually look at what the possibilities are regardless of the landfill contract that the Department supports and says is the best deal for San Francisco and ratepayers. It is much cheaper than the Waste Management proposal and is better for the environment because even though the landfill is farther away, a good portion of the transportation is using rail. Carbon emissions will be significantly less over the ten-year life of the contract. Director Nutter will be attending the Board of Supervisors meeting on Wednesday to make sure the Supervisor's questions are answered.

Director Nutter reported that she had attended a Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) meeting today, and they had released a consultant's study on solid waste management systems in the Bay Area, basically comparing what we have to other jurisdictions. What the study confirmed is that we have a very effective system. Our residential rates are either at or below other rates in the Bay Area, our commercial rates are on par with other Bay Area rates, and we also have one of the most comprehensive systems. The challenge that was highlighted was that we have a very unique rate process that no other jurisdiction has. Forty-five percent of Bay Area jurisdictions do sole-source contracting for their solid waste disposal and don't put it out to bid. They do have franchise fees or different types of contractual arrangements. San Francisco is unique in the way that we have a permit system that is mandate by ordinance. There will be continued discussion about whether this is the best system for San Francisco. The Department of the Environment has been on record saying this system works, and there is no reason to go forward with changing policies for a system that works. There are forces at work looking at some different options for how our system is structured. She hopes that on Wednesday we can move forward with the landfill contract and have some continued discussions about the money that Recology brings to the City and the benefits from working with them.

Director Nutter reported that the drug disposal test project is moving forward. A stakeholder meeting was held with the pharmaceutical industry, Supervisor Mirkarimi, and the Police Department. A project will be launched in three to four months where there will be pharmaceutical bins at five police stations and about fifteen local pharmacies that are interested in participating. The pharmaceutical industry has offered $110,000 to fund an 18-month pilot. It is producer responsibility at its best. We will be using the money to purchase the bins, pay for the disposal, as well as do the outreach for pharmaceutical disposal. The disposal will be done by a number of

companies that do the pickup and the incineration, which is the industry-accepted standard. It is the best option to get pharmaceuticals out of our homes and water at this time.

Public Comment: Ms. Harris inquired whether the project would include needles and syringes. Director Nutter stated that the project only includes pills.

Director Nutter reported that cell phone implementation is on hold at this time. Commissioner Wald reported that there has been a lot of press on cell phones that would encourage people to move ahead with the proposed legislation. Director Nutter stated that closed door sessions have been held at the City Attorney's Office where the City Attorney has been providing information about the legal case. She is hoping to have a policy direction in the next week or two.

The Yellow Pages topic the Department is supporting went back to the Controller for review of the economic impact of restricting the blind distribution of Yellow Pages. Mr. Pilpel reported that this agenda topic will be heard at the full Board on May 10.

9. **Announcements.** (Discussion)

Director Nutter encouraged attendance at the Mayor's Earth Day breakfast that is scheduled for Wednesday, April 20th from 8:00 to 10:00 a.m. An RSVP should be sent to Ms. Tamar Hurwitz. Commissioner Gravanis announced that the Planning Commission and the Treasure Island Board of Directors would be voting on the certification of the Treasure Island Environmental Impact Report on Thursday at 6:30 p.m.

Public Comment: Ms. Harris reported that President Obama would be at the San Francisco Masonic Auditorium on Wednesday, April 20 at 3:00 p.m. and encouraged people to attend to advocate for environmental causes. She stated that there would be many activist groups there including those advocating for social security.

10. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)

Ms. Fish announced that the next Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for May 9, 2011. Director Nutter stated that (1) a cell phone update may be ready for the May 9 meeting; (2) the America's Cup Sustainability Plan would be scheduled for the June 13 meeting; and (3) she would consult with Deputy Director Assmann on a presentation on battery Extended Producer Responsibility. Commissioner Wald suggested a review of the Outreach List for the May 9th meeting.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel suggested that the Commission take up a practice of adding a forward agenda list to each Committee and Commission agenda so that the public has a sense of upcoming items.

11. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.

    Mr. Pilpel inquired about the status of reappointments to the Commission on the Environment. Director Nutter reported that there should be news in the next day or two.

12. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary,
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 9, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

Approved:

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

*RESCHEDULED MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 10 2011
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2011, 5:00 P.M.
DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT ECO CENTER
11 GROVE STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

The Regular Meeting of the Commission on the Environment Policy Committee that regularly meets at City Hall, Room 421, has been RESCHEDULED to Monday, April 18, 2011 and will be held at the Department of the Environment Eco Center, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA .

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:00 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Excused: Commissioner Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the February 14, 2011 Policy Committee Rescheduled Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: February 14, 2011 Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the February 14, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash).

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

4. **GreenFinance SF Program Update.** Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald; Speaker: Richard Chien, Private Sector Green Building Coordinator, GreenFinanceSF Program Manager (Explanatory Document: GreenFinance SF Commercial Program) (Informational Report and Discussion)

   Mr. Chien provided an informational report on San Francisco's PACE program (GreenFinance SF) that was established in order to provide homeowners with financing to install green renovation projects on private buildings. The City created a special clean energy financing district through Mello-Roos law that enables the sale of bonds to provide the upfront financing for clean energy improvements on private properties. Repayment would be secured by a senior tax lien assessed by the City and County local government and recollected through the property tax billing process until the principal and interest was paid for. It was an effective way to spread high up front costs over a longer period of time and address challenges to securing capital for these types of projects. The cost would be transferable to a new property owner as long as that benefit was still being paid for by the special tax.

   San Francisco launched its residential program with great support from the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor. There was a lot of outreach to target residential homeowners in San Francisco to make them aware of the program. There was a very good response from homeowners, that was determined by how many people visited the website, how many applications were started, feedback from contractors, and the number of people who requested financing. Three weeks after the program was launched on April 12, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac released letters to their lenders saying they were uncomfortable with these programs. A couple of months later, the Federal Housing Financing Agency that was created by Congress to oversee Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, released a definitive statement that these programs posed "safety and soundness" concerns to the mortgage industry. The liens created by these types of locally administered programs automatically go in front of the mortgage, so in case there is a foreclosure or default process, the senior lien would have to be paid off first. The fact that these assessments were minimal compared to the amount that people were borrowing for their mortgages and that the improvements would be adding value to the property, saving energy, and creating jobs got lost in that argument. The program had to be discontinued as a result.

   Mr. Chien explained that there was over $30 million dollars that was being administered through the California Energy Commission to support residential PACE programs that needed to find a new purpose in light of what happened. The focus now is to promote home-energy efficiency through a website and provide outreach and communication along with local governments and contractors about a financial clearinghouse that would be available to homeowners and would offer more traditional unsecured loan products. These would be pre-approved by the State

Treasurer's Office. In addition, there is some money from the original $33 million to continue PACE in light of those Federal Housing Financing Agency directives. Sonoma County is continuing their residential PACE program.

Mr. Chien stated that since the commercial sector is not affected by decisions of federal housing mortgage regulators, it is in a better position to launch without regulatory obstacles. The City is receiving just under $400,000 to provide a credit enhancement for our commercial PACE program that is scheduled to launch early this summer. Work is in progress with other grantees that include Sonoma and Placer Counties to test best practices in primarily commercial PACE and primarily with the City of Los Angeles and the Clinton Climate Initiative. The Clinton Climate Initiative is providing technical assistance to the City of Los Angeles and the other grantees on this variant of commercial PACE, which uses the owner arranged PACE financing model. This means that the building owner arranges their own lender for the capital improvements, and that capital provider gets all the benefits of the senior PACE lien to secure that repayment obligation. The reserve money that is being used as grant funds would hopefully provide more cushion to potential capital providers to encourage participation.

Mr. Chien provided a written summary (see explanatory document) that provides information on the history of what happened on the residential side and what was needed to reallocate all of the grant money to the commercial sector. There is strong interest to fix the problems in establishing PACE in the residential sector. There are negotiations with the regulatory agencies that unfortunately do not appear to be advancing, and there is litigation currently in progress. Lawsuits have been filed in four federal district courts; plaintiffs include the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), the California Attorney General, counties in Florida, New York, Sonoma and Placer Counties, Palm Desert, and the Sierra Club.

Public Comment

Mr. David Pilpel inquired about the concerns surrounding the residential PACE program. Mr. Chien reported that the concern is that locally administered community benefit district financing improvements to private properties for public purpose should not be the concern of a federal mortgage regulator, and that it is completely within the bounds of local governments to operate these types of programs. Commissioner Wald stated that the intent is to make it easier for people to partake in these programs. There is congressional uncertainty, so it does not seem that legislative avenues will provide a resolution, and litigation would take a number of years.

Commissioner Wald stated that Palm Desert had effectively worked with the legislature on a program that was designed to encourage people to put solar on roofs. Mr. Chien reported that Palm Desert supported the passage of 2008 Assembly Bill (AB) 811 that took the idea of property assessed clean energy financing and made it essentially

available to all jurisdictions in California. San Francisco and Berkeley being charter cities could do things that other governments were not as freely able to do. AB 811 clarified that all local governments can run these programs provided the legislative body authorizes it.

Commissioner Wald spoke in support of transferring the PACE program from the residential to the commercial sector. She asked if there was anything that could be done to facilitate solar development on homes, such as encouraging neighborhoods or blocks to bundle and deal with providers in ways that would significantly reduce their costs. Mr. Chien stated that the neighborhood or block approach is being actively pursued by groups such as "One Block off the Grid" that works nationally with solar developers and providers to engage city neighborhoods or blocks that have an interest in doing solar. They take a bulk purchasing approach to engaging with homeowners in a target submarket. Another financing option that is becoming more widely available is a solar lease or a Power Purchase Agreement, whereby a Power Purchase Agreement provider enters into a contract with a homeowner or commercial property owner but the homeowner does not own the asset, they just pay for the electricity at or below what they would normally pay for electricity from the utility.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether the Department has thought about playing a role in educating people about opportunities in a proactive way. For example, rather than waiting for one block to show interest, to tell people about one block and encourage them to make contact, in addition to providing them with more information about available options. She stated that the PACE program had removed all of that uncertainty. Mr. Chien stated that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) money helped create and support the home energy efficiency market. What happened with PACE was debilitating to that momentum. Now the California Energy Commission and the California Public Utilities Commission are working together to do a statewide branding marketing campaign called Energy Upgrade California. It is a web portal www.EnergyupgradeCA.org that contains consumer home performance education and links to contractors, local programs, utility rebate programs, with the goal of leading the homeowner through a thought process with reasons to participate. The financing portal will be established in the next few months. Mr. Chien stated that there was quite a bit of work that needed to be done because of what happened with the Federal Housing Finance Agency. The program is now oriented in a new direction with non-PACE financing, an energy efficiency incentive web portal, commercial PACE in other jurisdictions, and there are innovative solar activities. Mr. Chien stated that consideration could be given to coordinating efforts with our renewables programs and asking for feedback on how to get the word out.

Director Nutter stated that the Community Insight Project would be launched on Earth Day and would be a way to engage with other groups in this effort. The project is

focused on outreach, creating partnerships, and finding opportunities to highlight programs that we may not even be running in order to direct interest in resources of our constituents. There are entities out there doing good work that would ultimately help support departmental goals.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether any businesses have been targeted to participate in the commercial program. Mr. Chien stated that a commercial track had been developed with business groups such as Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) for the original GreenFinanceSF program, and outreach will begin again with the most recent iteration of the commercial program. He stated that large energy-efficiency companies have been requesting a commercial program in order to acquire this kind of low-cost financing. So much energy efficiency work has already been done in San Francisco with commercial building owners, so it will be an effort to discover who out of the eligible properties are left to speak to.

Public Comment: Ms. Nunes inquired about incentives for developing green roofs on commercial and residential properties. Mr. Chien stated that there are no current incentives to promote green roof technology. He stated that the City does have strict building requirements for new buildings, and installing a green roof would be a way to help meet these requirements for any particular class of buildings that are being built. Doing a green roof on a new construction project is much easier than on a retrofit. There are structural issues and other issues that become more significant when you are doing a retrofit. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is working aggressively on a citywide approach to managing City stormwater runoff, which includes a green roof component. Mr. Chien stated that because of our mild climate that does not receive a lot of rainfall compared to other jurisdictions, the overall cost of promoting a green roof technology would not be cost effective from a city programmatic perspective. An installation has been done on a City owned office building at One South Van Ness, so the technology is supported, but is not getting any specific financial incentives at this point.

Commissioner Wald inquired about white roofs. Mr. Chien stated that cool roofs are required under the new California Energy Code for commercial buildings in a re-roofing situation or new construction. The climate is so mild here, that some of these technologies are not considered to be very cost effective.

Mr. Pilpel reported that there were three roofs east of 3rd Street near Candlestick that had solar, but there was a block that didn't have it and could use it. He agrees with the idea of working block by block or in certain neighborhoods where you have a consistent roof type. He suggested talking to people about the program in areas where it would make sense. Mr. Pilpel suggested that Director Nutter promote these programs in her discussions with neighborhood groups, especially those located on the west side where they are generally not as supportive of some of the things that the Department of the Environment does as they could be. This is an opportunity to

promote programs that are financed in addition to other Department programs such as zero waste, transportation, toxics reduction.

Commissioner Gravanis discussed the importance of encouraging residential homeowners to consider installing some form of renewable energy. For some people, the incentive would be the belief that sometime in the future, they might be able to sell some of that energy to the grid. Along those lines, she has not been able to find anything in writing that PG&E's new smart meters are capable of measuring electrical flow in two directions and is awaiting a response from PG&E.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired about the timeframe for the feed-in tariff that has been discussed. Mr. Chien stated that he does not know when a decision will be made. There is a national group with a presence in California and other high opportunity states that is trying to engage with the business community to get political support to take it to the level of the legislature. They want to build grassroots support for this effort first so there is enough political will behind it.

Public Comment: Mr. Davis stated that his understanding is that current laws or the way that it is set up allows you to sell back to PG&E up to how much you use. He asked if there has been any discussion about changing the process. Mr. Chien stated that a feed-in tariff sets the price for electricity generation regardless of where it is coming from. If you have a solar system on your house, you would get at a rate of what you are producing. Mr. Davis asked if that would be across the board in California. Mr. Chien stated that that utilities, regulators and other agencies are working together to develop a better pricing strategy and address other structural issues to make these programs work better. Mr. Davis inquired if this action could turn California into an exporting energy source. Mr. Chien stated that it would provide an incentive for businesses and owners to become power providers if they knew they would be getting paid for it.

Mr. Chien stated that he would provide an update on the commercial program in June – August.

5. **America's Cup Sustainability Plan Guiding Principles and Focus Areas.** Sponsors: Commissioners Johanna Wald and Ruth Gravanis; Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (5 minutes) (Discussion)

Director Nutter provided an update on discussions held between the City, the America's Cup Event Authority and Organizing Committee on a Sustainability Plan for the America's Cup event to be held throughout the summer of 2012 as well as in 2013. The America's Cup Organizing Committee helps with fundraising for the Event Authority, and the Event Authority is the entity that is responsible for the host agreement and for the execution of the event.

The Department of the Environment initiated the Sustainability Plan with the Mayor's Office, the Event Authority, and the Organizing Committee as a way to create an umbrella document that pulls together all of the sustainability elements for America's Cup. Some of these elements are mandated in the host agreement, and some are San Francisco's mandates and laws. There are also elements of the Sustainability Plan that are aspirational, ambitious goals that the Department of the Environment and other entities envisioned for America's Cup. All proposals that the Department of Environment has made have not yet been approved by the Event Authority or Organizing Committee and are currently being discussed. After meeting for two months, a Draft Sustainability Plan was scoped out in the following focus areas:

- Carbon Footprint. What is the carbon footprint of the event? In the host agreement, it says that America's Cup will be carbon neutral. The Department is interested in exploring how to make America's Cup a climate positive event, which means going beyond being carbon neutral. There will be a focus on not only offsetting one-for-one carbon impact with mitigation, but finding funding for long-term infrastructure that would continue to provide carbon benefits to San Francisco after America's Cup events have been completed. This is something that the Clinton Climate Initiative has been championing.

- Carbon Offset Program. Are there opportunities to bring local funds to America's Cup through a carbon offset program? The Department of the Environment started a carbon offset fund a couple of years ago as a way to direct local offset funds back to local projects. We see this as a possible vehicle to use nationally and internationally to offset carbon as well as redirect funds back to local projects. There are many questions regarding verifiability and what third-party entity we may work with to provide that verifiability, as well as what those projects would be. Right now we are looking at expanding that vehicle as one of, if not the only, offset tool for people that are traveling here for America's Cup.

- Transportation Element. The Transportation Element is covered in a separate plan called *The People Plan* currently posted online at the Office of Economic and Workforce Development website. It was created mostly by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA) with input from the Department's Clean Transportation Team. The elements that the Department focused on in the Plan are (1) electric vehicles and if and when it would be appropriate to install charging stations at far off parking pods, and (2) supporting every opportunity to get people out of their cars by supporting expanded transit service, e.g. creating bike-sharing opportunities, etc.

- The LEED Plan, the building design element for existing and new buildings. The Department is responsible for writing the plan for this event. It will codify all of the rules, laws, and mandates around existing and newly constructed buildings and how they will be managed. It will integrate all of San Francisco's Green Building

Standards and find opportunities to go above and beyond those mandates to show that America's Cup can exceed our existing laws and mandates on green building.

- Waste Management. Mr. Alex Dmitriew of the Department of the Environment's Zero Waste Team reported that the Zero Waste Team presented a Waste Management Plan to the America's Cup Event Authority on March 31st. The document is called the Waste Management Plan because it is referenced as such in the host agreement, but a request will be made to change it to the Zero Waste Plan. He stated that there is an excellent opportunity to make this event a zero waste event, and the plan describes what sustainability is in terms of zero waste. To help the Event Authority understand the environment we have in San Francisco, the plan references Ordinances that will impact the operations of the America's Cup, e.g., the Mandatory Composting and Recycling Ordinance, the Construction and Demolition Debris Ordinance, and the Food Service Waste Ordinance. It specifies that there should be compliance through the permit process for street events, and that event organizers produce a plan on how they will recycle materials from specific events. There is also a Plastic Bag Ordinance ban that won't directly apply to event vendors, but discussions have been held about legislatively expanding the scope of the Ordinance to additional retail establishments.

  A statement is being made that part of the zero waste concept is to hold a plastics-free event that will be tied into the impacts that plastic has on the marine environment. Commissioner Wald stressed the importance of not having single-serve water bottles available. Mr. Dmitriew stated that a Global Tap solution would be requested. Conversations will also be held with souvenir vendors and banner producers about the importance of not supplying plastic bags.

  The Waste Management Plan deals with the reality that we are going to have materials produced at events. Events will be held all over the City, primarily on the waterfront. The Department was tasked with producing estimates of material that would be generated from these events and has put together a policy framework. It has procured the services of Environmental Science Associates (ESA) to help put together the document. There will be many factors to consider. Not only will the event have spectator events, but the event will also have support facilities and the village being constructed that will contribute to the construction and demolition component. There is an unknown capacity for spectator vessels, such as private yachts, and temporary piers will be constructed. Estimates have been provided to Recology who is now working with the Department and ESA to determine the most cost-effective approach. The Waste Management Plan was favorably received by City agencies, and staff will be waiting for comments from the public. Director Nutter thanked Mr. Dmitriew and the Zero Waste Team on their work on the Plan.

- Clean Tech. Harnessing partnerships with clean tech companies would help ensure that renewables are a critical part of America's Cup. Clean tech was added as a way to integrate renewables into the America's Cup event by finding sponsorship opportunities with local clean tech companies. It is a way for local companies to showcase new and innovative technologies that could be helpful in meeting America's Cup sustainability goals at reducing carbon and offsetting diesel power generators. The Department will be convening clean tech companies and discussing opportunities to partner with America's Cup this summer.

- Integrating Local Food Policy. A discussion was held on how to raise awareness about sustainable organic food, specifically sustainable local seafood, in order to ensure that vendors are following strict policies and highlighting restaurants that follow sustainable food practices.

- Outreach and Education regarding the bay and our estuaries. America's Cup is funding a global entity called One World Oceans to raise awareness about oceans in a global sense. Discussions are being held to ensure that education and outreach is not only about the Pacific gyre and oceans generally, but specifically addresses the characteristics of our bay, our waterways, our estuaries, and the restoration that we would like to see locally as well as the health of the bay.

Director Nutter discussed the process moving forward. She explained that the Sustainability Plan does not yet contain budget numbers or an implementation timeline and has not been benchmarked against other large events with sustainability plans in a comprehensive way. The Event Authority and Organizing Committee authorized the Department to hire a consultant to help us take the Sustainability Plan to the next level. The scope of work to be included in that plan will be distributed to some of our contractors this week and includes benchmarking our plan to other big sporting events like Vancouver 2010, London 2012, and other sustainability plans as well as other America's Cups. This will provide context to what is happening in other event areas and generate new ideas for what is not currently in the plan. The consultant has been asked to spell out legal requirements, host committee commitments and aspirational goals. When the Sustainability Plan is fleshed out and implementation timeline and budget numbers are completed, we'll be better able to demonstrate the possibility of including bold elements that take us a step farther than San Francisco mandates and are economically achievable.

Director Nutter stated that the consultant will be developing measurements and metrics for success, identifying a timeline and budget for each area, identifying roles and responsibilities, and proposing a draft plan for review in early June. The reason this plan is so critical is because resources have not yet been committed for sustainability for America's Cup. The event agreement identified approximately $32 million related to transportation and other elements, but has not identified funding for the Sustainability Element. This document will show that not only are these things

achievable, but will give some reality to the money that will have to be raised to implement comprehensive sustainability strategies for America's Cup.

Commissioner Gravanis asked who would be hiring the consultant. Director Nutter stated that the Department of the Environment would be doing the hiring, but that the Event Authority and the Organizing Committee would be raising the money to pay for the proposal as well as participating in the process. The Department will be identifying the existing contractor and overseeing the scope of work and the Draft Sustainability Plan that will be distributed this week. Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether the Sustainability Plan would be placed on a website for public response. Director Nutter stated that it would be posted, but not for several months.

Commissioner Gravanis commended the Waste Management Plan that lays out the mandates and provides background. She suggested that (1) stronger language be used to require that mandates be followed instead of merely encouraged or recommended; (2) that fines be issued for non-compliance; and (3) to identify an entity that would be communicating with vendors on the "no single-serve water bottles should be sold" message. She inquired who would be in charge of contracts and lease agreements.

Mr. Dmitriew stated that the Waste Management Plan strongly states that a Zero Waste Coordinator should be hired to perform zero waste goals. The Department will supply the technical data, educate people on choices, make service suggestions, and do the signage, but ultimately it is up to the vendors to comply. The only way to enforce mandates is contractually with the Event Authority and its vendors as well as event organizers who are very much part of this system. Commissioner Wald stated that standard contract terms for compliance are needed so there is a vehicle for the Zero Waste Coordinator. The Coordinator has to be there when the contract forms are drawn up and have the authority to do whatever is needed to determine whether those contract terms are complied with. However, they can't be responsible to make sure that every contract says the right things. There has to be standard terms for different activities and all activities have to be identified.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether the America's Cup Organizing Committee and America's Cup Event Authority would contract with a master event organizer who would then be responsible for writing all of these specifics based on our City laws. Mr. Dmitriew stated that the event organizer would also be working with Department staff to provide technical information.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether there have been conversations with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) about bringing water lines to the main spectator sites to make either permanent or temporary jug fillers available. Director Nutter reported that SFPUC has not been present at the meetings she has attended and will have to be consulted. There has been discussion with the Event Authority and

other City agencies about no single-serve water bottles and a global tap or similar operation solution, which has been integrated into the Sustainability Plan. She explained that there are many different teams meeting at different times, and it may be that SFPUC has been involved in other discussions.

Commissioner Gravanis suggested estimating the amount of water that spectators are expected to drink and the number of locations where jug fillers should be installed. She suggested that an estimate be made for the number of port-a-potties that should be made available as well. It would be appropriate for the organizer to issue a request for a company or multiple companies to bid on the job. Director Nutter stated that opportunities for Requests for Proposals should be identified for other elements of sustainability services.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that one of the Department of the Environment's main roles in the People Plan appeared to relate to electric cars and charging stations. The America's Cup Environment Council does not want to see a lot of our staff resources devoted to this effort because the focus should be to get people out of cars. It is a significant mixed message that if you are rich enough to buy an electric car, then it is okay for you to drive. More attention should be given to alternatives such as making bike rental facilities available at all transit hubs in order to make it easier for people to leave their cars at home. Director Nutter stated that the feedback from the America's Cup Environment Council has helped adjust the Department's focus in that area.

Commissioner Wald urged that there be an extra effort made to provide education about the principles underlying the sustainability component of this event. She stated that it is not too early to think about how to prioritize the eight components of the Sustainability Plan just in case the event organizer won't agree to all components and a trade may be possible. She endorsed Commissioner Gravanis's comments about strengthening the language and issuing fines for violations so people are held accountable. It should be made clear that San Francisco will do a report card on this event and will tell the world how sustainable it is even if we are disappointed. Measuring success needs to be a major part of the effort so that when future events are planned, the benchmarking exercise is based on real data. Director Nutter stated that the Event Authority has an interest in creating this event as a model. Metrics for success are needed for the City to be able to evaluate and share publicly, so whatever claims that are made following the event can be backed up with real data.

Public Comment

Ms. Lurilla Harris discussed the difficulty that handicapped persons may have taking public transportation to the event and asked that consideration be given to the potential impacts of not having charging stations on handicapped persons.

Mr. David Pilpel stated that Mr. Mike Martin, prior to his current assignment, worked at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, so he would presumably have knowledge about the wastewater and water component. He confirmed that the Waste Management Plan has been published and is available for public review on the Office of Economic and Workforce Development website. Mr. Pilpel inquired whether the eight sustainability elements have been committed to in writing. Director Nutter reported that the document would be published potentially tomorrow. He asked that the document as it evolves be made available to the public at each juncture and at future meetings when this topic is being discussed in order to encourage public comment.

Commissioner Wald stated that there is expertise available for input from Natural Resources Defense Council, which has invested substantial resources into greening the Oscars and NFL that might be directly relevant to this process. She discussed the vast amount of paper that will be produced at the event.

Mr. Pilpel stated that receipts containing BPA could be issued if we don't pay attention and discussed the possibility of creating labels for local food. He suggested that grocery stores also consider the practice of labeling food with a local message, so this idea can be used on an ongoing basis and not just for special events.

Mr. Michael Davis, US Pure Water, stated that US Pure Water has been working with the City and County of San Francisco for a long time helping transition from bottled water to non-bottled water, and over the last four years has saved the City and County over $700,000. US Pure Water is a mission-driven company and one of its missions is to influence people away from bottled water. He discussed his experience facilitating a lot of different events with permanent and temporary installations and offered his expertise for this event.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that NRDC is one of the member organizations in the America's Cup Environmental Council, which includes people with all kinds of expertise, such as the Baykeeper who knows a lot about water, fueling and boat traffic, and other organizations such as the Audubon Society and the Native Plant Society that are interested in making sure that our valuable habitat will not be trampled on. She stated that the Policy Committee has been reviewing the Outreach List and Survey in order to engage the environmental community, and that this event would be an excellent opportunity for the Commission to work collaboratively with the non-profit community on an issue together. Commissioner Gravanis stated that this effort has started with Director Nutter convening a meeting with City staff people and members of the America's Cup Environmental Council and hopes for it to continue.

Commissioner Wald stated that this is an opportunity to reach out to the community about a real event with real consequences, real impacts, and real opportunities for people to provide their input on what to do and suggested that the Committee

review the Commission Outreach List at its next meeting. Director Nutter suggested identifying key people in each area to provide feedback before it goes out to a consultant and a wider audience. This would accelerate the process and keep the costs down for the consultant process. Commissioner Gravanis stated that there would be people that would be happy to volunteer their time to providing input, but suggested that input be gathered early in the process, whether it is the general public or smaller group of people with specific expertise in these focus areas. Commissioner Wald stated that the America's Cup Event Authority could be the vehicle for the early review knowing that that group would be the nucleus of the group that we would be working with in the bigger and longer-term process.

Public Comment

Ms. Harris suggested having concrete questions ready before consulting with experts.

Ms. Nunes stated that she is working on a Zero Waste Plan for San Francisco State University and inquired whether any ideas or solutions have been identified on how to implement the Zero Waste Plan for the America's Cup. Mr. Dmitriew stated that it is a complex endeavor, but San Francisco is fortunate that it has the best infrastructure and base for doing a Zero Waste Plan. The Construction and Demolition Debris Ordinance specifies that any construction and demolition debris gets mixed together so it is not separated on site and has to go to a facility that is capable of processing that material and recovering a minimum of 65% of that material. The Ordinance has mandated that we identify these facilities, certify them and are comfortable that they do achieve these diversion rates. There are also excellent programs and cost incentives to contractors that get involved in separation on site so they can significantly reduce their costs.

Mr. Dmitriew stated that San Francisco has the most highly developed commercial infrastructure for organics recovery and composting. Even though this venue is complex, it will fit well into San Francisco's well-established food-collection system. We are not reinventing anything or identifying something new to deal with this particular volume. The same is true of the Food Service Waste Ordinance that bans the use of Styrofoam food containers by food-service establishments in San Francisco. It addition to that ban, it also mandates that the replacement of food-service ware items have to be either compostable or recyclable. Most of the food vendors doing business in the city are well aware of the Ordinance requirements as well as the event organizers, so it is an achievable goal

Mr. Dmitriew stated that the plastics issue will be more challenging. The Event Authority will have to agree with these requirements, and contractual language will have to be established. There is a plastic bag ban for major supermarkets and pharmacies in the city, so the notion of bringing your own bag is there, but additional

education is needed. The Waste Management Plan calls for giving preference to vendors that can sell reusable bottles and bags.

Mr. Davis stated that US Pure Water will be providing two refillable water stations at the Earth Day Celebration this Saturday. He stated that a lot of people that are going to these events, especially Earth Day, which is a more environmentally-conscious event, will come with their refillable bottles already. Mr. Davis pointed out that using compostable cups may lead to a single-use because they would be harder to carry around at an event.

Mr. Pilpel stated that this event leads to an opportunity in coordination with non-profits to educate the public on Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) principles in addition to the reuse, reduce and repair message. He stated that the Fats Oil and Grease (FOG) Ordinance will now require that certain types of businesses install grease removal devices. He suggested that America's Cup food service vendors should also install these types of grease removal devices so that trap grease is not added to the system, and food waste is sent to the green cart rather than the sewer system.

The America's Cup Sustainability Plan was continued for further discussion to the June 13, 2011 Policy Committee meeting.

6. **Process for Issuing Environmental Pioneer Rewards.** Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald (Discussion)

Commissioner Wald reported that the intent of this agenda item is to discuss if the Department of the Environment should reward environmental leaders for their commitment and performance in San Francisco and if so how. It would be another way to connect the work that the Department and Commission are doing with real people who live in the city. Director Nutter and Commissioner Gravanis pointed out that depending on the process, it could require a lot of staff time and funding. Commissioner Gravanis stated that it could be a fundable budget item because someone may want to contribute to this type of event. It would also bring visibility for people that deserve the recognition.

A discussion was held on the best way to incorporate this type of event into current programming instead of a stand-alone event that may not be cost-effective and involve a lot of staff time. Director Nutter pointed out possibilities that include issuing awards annually at the Mayor's Earth Day breakfast, the Green Business Awards in January, the newly created Blue Green Awards in June that will recognize departments that are doing well with their Climate Action Plans, or the Department's quarterly open house to raise the profile of events at the Eco Center. She suggested that the Department's Outreach team consider how to connect this type of programming with the Community Insight Project in a special fall ceremony.

Commissioner Wald stated that the process should advance our agenda and be cost-effective at the same time. She suggested spotlighting the activities of people to their neighbors so that people understand that the work of the department is not unrelated to people like them.
Director Nutter compared this process with the Neighborhood Empowerment Network (NEN) awards event that was held this past year that highlighted local community members who have contributed to their neighborhood by working on local projects. She suggested partnering with NEN on a whole new green awards section.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel stated that he supports the idea of recognizing people for their achievements, but questioned the feasibility of annual awards. He suggested including awards as part of an existing event and additionally recognizing those that merit an award in the short term so that people are not overlooked in the interim. He cited the Urban Agriculture project as an example of a project that merits an award or some sort of publicity in the short term. He suggested seeking the input of staff at the bi-weekly staff meetings and for the Department to inquire with its grantees on who they would like to spotlight.

Commissioner Wald stated that the award issued does not have to be a formal award with nominations taken. It could be an award issued on a sporadic basis and could require minimal resources. The Department of the Environment's webpage could periodically highlight the activities of an individual as a way for people to understand that the work that the Department does has real live utility and consequences. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that staff present options to the Committee at a future meeting.

This agenda topic was continued to the Call of the Chair.

7. **Global Tap Program Status Update – Staff Written Report.** Sponsor: Commissioner Johanna Wald (Explanatory Document: Global Tap Status Written Report) (Informational Report and Discussion)

Commissioner Wald stated that written reports are a good way of doing Commission business and should be utilized more in the future. Commissioners should provide input into the best vehicle for providing information on the topics they are interested in. Commissioner Gravanis concurred that it is helpful to receive reports in advance of the meeting whether or not a presentation is given. It provides an opportunity for the Commissioners to frame questions and do research. She expressed her appreciation for the work that Ms. Kass has done on this program.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that she is uncomfortable with the use of the term "Global Tap" for a Department project because it is the name of a company. She suggested that the Public Utilities Commission and the Department of the Environment's naming convention be the same, e.g., the Tap Water project. She

stated that SFPUC has given Global Tap credit for donating a lot of these facilities and their work with staff, but it has not named the campaign after them. Commissioner Gravanis stated that the SFPUC website lists Global Tap's logo there along with the Department of the Environment's and a number of other entities that have been involved in this project. She wants to ensure that as the program is expanded, that other potential companies and providers are given an opportunity to offer their expertise and equipment so all resources can be taken advantage of to encourage people to drink tap water. Director Nutter offered to bring this issue to the Outreach Team to rename the campaign. Commissioner Gravanis reported that SFPUC's website name for this project is Drink SFWater. Commissioner Wald suggested SFTap as a possible naming convention.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that she would like to raise people's awareness of bringing their own refillable water bottles wherever they go. She suggested moving ahead initially on a voluntary campaign to make sure that single-serve water bottles are not provided at events held on city property and then to move forward with an Ordinance in the future if warranted. Commissioner Wald suggested that the culmination of that campaign should be at the America's Cup event. There should be outreach to people now about bringing their own refillable bottles. Commissioner Gravanis pointed out that people attending the America's Cup event are not only San Franciscans, but will be from all over the world.

Public Comment

Ms. Harris asked if furnishing stainless steel water bottles with the Department of the Environment's logo at a minimal or at cost for people who come to these huge gatherings from around the world would be in the budget. Director Nutter reported that SFWater has them and SFPUC distributes these types of bottles, but she does not think there is a large enough budget for stainless steel bottles. She explained that the Department has traditionally spent its outreach budget on canvas bags, but water bottles could be discussed. Director Nutter stated that the America's Cup Event Authority or vendors should consider paying for and distributing free commemorative America's Cup stainless steel water bottles as a way to influence people who come to the event to refill their water bottle.

Mr. Pilpel suggested that stainless steel water bottles should be sold at cost or for two dollars, which is what it would cost for a plastic water bottle.

8. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

Director Nutter highlighted policy items. She reported that the Recology landfill contract is back at the Budget and Finance Committee on Wednesday of this week. It was continued for about two months in order for the Department to look into options

such as including the Port in the solid-waste process in the short or long-term. The Department has had many discussions with the Port on this topic. Exploratory memos have been issued that included specific information about the cost of barging, which was one of the interesting topics for review; however, it was determined that there is no short-term option for Port participation into our solid waste infrastructure. The Port is not interested in testing barging of recyclables, which we thought may be a possibility due to economics. The idea of an integrated facility at the Port instead of Brisbane is an interesting long-term idea that is seven to ten years away. The Department has commissioned a study to actually look at what the possibilities are regardless of the landfill contract that the Department supports and says is the best deal for San Francisco and ratepayers. It is much cheaper than the Waste Management proposal and is better for the environment because even though the landfill is farther away, a good portion of the transportation is using rail. Carbon emissions will be significantly less over the ten-year life of the contract. Director Nutter will be attending the Board of Supervisors meeting on Wednesday to make sure the Supervisor's questions are answered.

Director Nutter reported that she had attended a Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) meeting today, and they had released a consultant's study on solid waste management systems in the Bay Area, basically comparing what we have to other jurisdictions. What the study confirmed is that we have a very effective system. Our residential rates are either at or below other rates in the Bay Area, our commercial rates are on par with other Bay Area rates, and we also have one of the most comprehensive systems. The challenge that was highlighted was that we have a very unique rate process that no other jurisdiction has. Forty-five percent of Bay Area jurisdictions do sole-source contracting for their solid waste disposal and don't put it out to bid. They do have franchise fees or different types of contractual arrangements. San Francisco is unique in the way that we have a permit system that is mandate by ordinance. There will be continued discussion about whether this is the best system for San Francisco. The Department of the Environment has been on record saying this system works, and there is no reason to go forward with changing policies for a system that works. There are forces at work looking at some different options for how our system is structured. She hopes that on Wednesday we can move forward with the landfill contract and have some continued discussions about the money that Recology brings to the City and the benefits from working with them.

Director Nutter reported that the drug disposal test project is moving forward. A stakeholder meeting was held with the pharmaceutical industry, Supervisor Mirkarimi, and the Police Department. A project will be launched in three to four months where there will be pharmaceutical bins at five police stations and about fifteen local pharmacies that are interested in participating. The pharmaceutical industry has offered $110,000 to fund an 18-month pilot. It is producer responsibility at its best. We will be using the money to purchase the bins, pay for the disposal, as well as do the outreach for pharmaceutical disposal. The disposal will be done by a number of

companies that do the pickup and the incineration, which is the industry-accepted standard. It is the best option to get pharmaceuticals out of our homes and water at this time.

Public Comment: Ms. Harris inquired whether the project would include needles and syringes. Director Nutter stated that the project only includes pills.

Director Nutter reported that cell phone implementation is on hold at this time. Commissioner Wald reported that there has been a lot of press on cell phones that would encourage people to move ahead with the proposed legislation. Director Nutter stated that closed door sessions have been held at the City Attorney's Office where the City Attorney has been providing information about the legal case. She is hoping to have a policy direction in the next week or two.

The Yellow Pages topic the Department is supporting went back to the Controller for review of the economic impact of restricting the blind distribution of Yellow Pages. Mr. Pilpel reported that this agenda topic will be heard at the full Board on May 10.

9. **Announcements.** (Discussion)

Director Nutter encouraged attendance at the Mayor's Earth Day breakfast that is scheduled for Wednesday, April 20th from 8:00 to 10:00 a.m. An RSVP should be sent to Ms. Tamar Hurwitz. Commissioner Gravanis announced that the Planning Commission and the Treasure Island Board of Directors would be voting on the certification of the Treasure Island Environmental Impact Report on Thursday at 6:30 p.m.

Public Comment: Ms. Harris reported that President Obama would be at the San Francisco Masonic Auditorium on Wednesday, April 20 at 3:00 p.m. and encouraged people to attend to advocate for environmental causes. She stated that there would be many activist groups there including those advocating for social security.

10. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)

Ms. Fish announced that the next Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for May 9, 2011. Director Nutter stated that (1) a cell phone update may be ready for the May 9 meeting; (2) the America's Cup Sustainability Plan would be scheduled for the June 13 meeting; and (3) she would consult with Deputy Director Assmann on a presentation on battery Extended Producer Responsibility. Commissioner Wald suggested a review of the Outreach List for the May 9th meeting.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel suggested that the Commission take up a practice of adding a forward agenda list to each Committee and Commission agenda so that the public has a sense of upcoming items.

11. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.

    Mr. Pilpel inquired about the status of reappointments to the Commission on the Environment. Director Nutter reported that there should be news in the next day or two.

12. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary,
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 9, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

Approved: May 9, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING AND AGENDA
MONDAY, MAY 9, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOOLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY - 2 2011
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS
Public comment will be taken before the Committee takes action on any item.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.**
2. **Approval of Minutes of the April 18, 2011 Policy Committee Rescheduled Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: April 18, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)
3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
4. **Update on Pharmaceutical Waste Initiatives.** Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter; Staff Speakers: Marjaneh Zarrehparvar, Toxics Reduction Program Coordinator and Caitlin Sanders, Toxics Reduction Program Associate (20 minutes) (Informational Report and Discussion)
5. **San Francisco Home Improvement and Performance (SFHIP) and Green Home Assessment Program Updates.** Staff Speakers: Cal Broomhead, Energy Manager, Raymond Manion, Program Manager and Friday Werner, Marketing Coordinator (10 minutes) (Informational Report and Discussion)
6. **Community InSight Project Update.** Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter; Staff Speakers: Director Melanie Nutter, Mark Westlund, Public Outreach Program Manager, Thea Hillman, Communications Manager, Pauli Ojea and Cara Gurney, Green Jobs Assistant Coordinators (30 minutes) (Informational Presentation and Discussion)

Department of the Environment, City and County of San Francisco
11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 355-3700 • Fax: (415) 554-6393
Email: environment@sfgov.org • www.sfenvironment.org
100% Post-Consumer Recycled Paper

7. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** Sponsor: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Monica Fish, Commission Secretary (5 minutes) (Explanatory Document: Commission Outreach Draft List) (Informational Report and Discussion)
8. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Repor and Discussion)
9. **Announcements.** (Discussion)
10. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)
11. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
12. **Adjournment.**

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary, Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 13, 2011at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee , or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org within three business days of a meeting. If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Commission Policy Committee after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Department of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 during normal office hours or will be made available at the Policy Committee meeting website link https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee as attachments included with the agenda or meeting minutes.

Important Information

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the Committee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Committee members. Any written comments should be sent to: Commission Secretary of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Comments which cannot be delivered to the Commission Secretary by that time may be taken directly to the hearing at the location above. When bringing handouts to meetings, please photocopy on both sides of the paper and try to use post-consumer recycled or tree-free paper. Also, please bring sufficient copies of handouts for the Committee, the Commission Secretary and the public.

Public Comment

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but are not on today's agenda. Public comment will be taken following each agendized item. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes, unless otherwise announced by the Chair. If it is demonstrated that the comments
by the public will exceed 15 minutes, the Chair may continue Public Comment to another time during the meeting.

The Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue not appearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In response to public comment, not on an agendized item, the Committee is limited to:

1. Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
2. Request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
3. Directing staff to place the item or issue on a future agenda (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Disability Access

The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meeting will be held at City Hall, Room 421, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, in the Civic Center area. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the Civic Center Station at United Nations Plaza and Market Street. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro Stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For information about MUNI accessible services call (415) 923-6142. There is accessible curbside parking adjacent to City Hall on Grove Street and Van Ness Avenue and in the vicinity of the Veterans Building at 401 Van Ness Avenue adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Monica Fish at (415) 355-3709 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call the Mayor's Office on Disability at (415) 554-6789 or (415) 554-6799 (TTY) for further information.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance
(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Sunshine Task Force Administrator, City Hall, Room 409, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683 at Phone No.: (415) 554-7724; Fax No.: (415) 554-7854; E-mail: sotf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3112; web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Posted: May 2, 2011

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

MAY 25 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

MONDAY, MAY 9, 2011, 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL, ROOM 421

ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:00 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald, Gravanis and Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the April 18, 2011 Policy Committee Rescheduled Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: April 18, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Prakash, the April 18, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Commissioners Wald, Gravanis and Prakash).

   Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel commended the Commission Secretary on the meeting minutes.

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

tem 6 was heard before Items 4-5. Item 5 was heard before Item 4.

4. **Update on Pharmaceutical Waste Initiatives.** Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter; Staff Speaker: Caitlin Sanders, Toxics Reduction Program Associate (Informational Report and Discussion)

Ms. Sanders reported on her work setting up programs for residents to make it easier to dispose of household hazardous waste. She stated that disposal of pharmaceuticals has been worked on for a long time, and a lot has happened since Ms. Zarrehparvar issued a report to the Committee back in 2009 discussing (1) the United States Geological Survey study on pharmaceutical contamination of water bodies; and (2) barriers to running collection programs due to funding, and a federal law that prohibits anyone other than law enforcement to collect controlled substances.

Ms. Sanders provided a history of San Francisco's previous attempts at setting up collection programs. The Household Hazardous Waste facility had collected pharmaceuticals for approximately fifteen years, but due to concerns about not being able to filter out controls, they stopped the program. There have been one-day citywide collection events at law enforcement agencies in partnership with the Drug Enforcement Agency and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. Back in 2006 there was a temporary three-day pharmacy collection event at Walgreens. There was a brief period where Pharmaca, a pharmacy in Cole Valley, partnered with the Department of the Environment, but also dropped out of the program because of concerns with not being able to filter out controls.

In 2010, Supervisor Mirkarimi consulted with the Department of the Environment for new ideas for legislation. In order to resolve the funding barrier as well as the Drug Enforcement Agency's law, one idea and solution presented was Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for pharmaceuticals. Supervisor Mirkarimi worked with the California Product Stewardship Council to draft an Ordinance that was introduced in 2010, but did not come back until six months later in October when it was approved by the Public Safety Committee with a 2-1 vote. At the full Board meeting, the pharmaceutical manufacturers expressed their concern with the legislation, lobbied, and denied responsibility for this waste stream. It became apparent that the argument was a weak one. The next avenue was for the pharmaceutical industry to request a more reasonable stakeholder process where collaborative approaches were considered rather than an ordinance to develop and implement their own collection program only in the city San Francisco.

The ordinance was postponed for about four weeks, and a series of meetings were held with representatives from the pharmaceutical industry, McKesson, Genentech, biotech companies, Safeway and Walgreens. It became apparent that whether or not the Ordinance moved forward, something needed to be done. The pharmaceutical industry offered funding for a pilot collection program and to work on this collaborative approach. Pharma, the trade association for pharmaceutical manufacturers offered $100,000 and Genentech offered $10,000. Since then, work has been in progress to flesh out the details of the program.

The Department wanted to involve Walgreens since it has partnership programs with them to collect batteries and cell phones, but they chose not to participate in the program. In the past few weeks, 17 of 26 local independent pharmaceutical companies have signed on to run a collection program that will kick off in August. In addition, five police stations have decided to

participate in order to collect controlled substances. Pharmacies were selected as the most logical place to collect pharmaceuticals because lots of calls from the public to the Department on this topic were referred by pharmacies since people went there first to try to dispose of their drugs. Ms. Sanders reported that out of the eleven supervisory districts, nine of them have independent pharmacies in them and out of those nine districts there is one pharmacy for each participating. Ms. Sanders reported that Pharmaca opted not to participate at this time because they are following the example of Walgreens and other competitors.

Ms. Sanders reported that since the Pharmaca collection stopped in the last couple of years, the Department of the Environment has been running a pilot program offering pharmaceutical collection envelopes to the public, but not a lot of outreach has been done around this program because the envelopes cost the Department $3.75 a piece. At the same time, some type of solution was needed because of the number of calls received, so these envelopes were offered to the public for free, but now they are sold at Walgreens, Kaiser and Safeway. That may be the number one motivation why Walgreens does not want to participate because they have a financial incentive as an alternative.

Ms. Sanders reported that another ordinance introduced by Supervisor Mirkarimi that has to do with the pharmaceutical program is being discussed at the Small Business Commission this evening. Once the Extended Producer Responsibility Ordinance was tabled, an alternative Ordinance was introduced that requires all stores in San Francisco that sell pharmaceuticals to advertise where people can safely dispose of pharmaceutical waste. The Department of the Environment is in charge of developing regulations determining what the materials will look like and for enforcement if the Ordinance is approved.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether doctors that are prescribers of pharmaceuticals could be involved in the collection program. Ms. Sanders reported that doctors' offices and clinics have their own reverse distribution systems where they can reverse distribute the drugs back to the pharmaceutical manufacturers; however, there are contamination concerns about taking back expired or unwanted medications. Doctors and clinics are not typically distributing pharmaceuticals, so a pharmacy would be the more logical place where a resident would go back to. Commissioner Wald stated that lots of people get their medicines through mail order companies not located in San Francisco, so doctors could be encouraged to tell people when they write a prescription where to dispose of pharmaceutical waste through a handout of some sort or a sticker. She suggested that stickers be considered so people do not keep calling the department for disposal instructions. Ms. Sanders stated that there is $50,000 that has been budgeted to outreach that has allowed for outreach at some clinics and that she would bring this idea to Outreach staff.

Ms. Sanders reported that in November 2010, a new federal law was passed that gives the Attorney General the power to rewrite regulations to allow places other than law enforcement agencies to collect controlled substances. It is to be determined what those regulations will be, but it will most likely allow places such as clinics, hospice facilities and senior homes to collect as well. Commissioner Prakash stated that it makes sense to work with the larger medical groups in San Francisco rather than clinics that have only a few doctors. Commissioner Wald stated that these medical groups hold meetings every month and suggested that staff attend a meeting.

5. **San Francisco Home Improvement and Performance (SFHIP) and Green Home Assessment Program Updates.** Staff Speakers: Cal Broomhead, Energy Manager and Matt Greco, San Francisco Boiler Systems Incentives Program Manager (Explanatory Documents: San Francisco Boiler Systems Incentive Program and Green Homes Assessment Survey) (Informational Report and Discussion)

San Francisco Boiler Incentives Program. Mr. Matt Greco reported that this program targets inefficient boilers and associated heating equipment in multi-family and Single Room Occupancy (SRO) properties in San Francisco. It is a successful program launched in July of last year that is funded by the federal stimulus bill. To date, 122 project applications have been received, 95 of which are complete, and nearly $2 million worth of work has been leveraged. This program creates jobs in San Francisco. Its main purpose is to replace old boilers in multi-family properties that were built in the 1920's and 1930's, many of which are original boilers, with new energy-efficient low pressure steam boilers and hydronic heating and domestic water boilers.

Public Comment: Ms. Lurilla Harris inquired whether solar in included in this program. Mr. Broomhead explained that solar is not part of the program.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether there is a formula for estimating the savings from converting the old boilers to new ones. Mr. Greco reported that the California Energy Commission hired a consultant who developed a Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS) that contains statewide and utility specific results. It includes data on all residential appliances, equipment and general usage habits for space heating, domestic hot water use, lights, refrigeration, etc. This program utilizes various equations using this data in the baseline of existing equipment efficiency, which sometimes is assumed, and the new measure for new equipment efficiency, and based on that data, therm usage can be projected.

Mr. Greco reported that one customer during the peak heating season is saving $500 a month on his energy bill on a 34-unit building. The cost to replace this boiler, which was capsulated with asbestos, was $28,000. A local boiler contractor did the work, and the Department of the Environment program incentivized about $7000 of that project. In addition, he is receiving the $500 a month savings during the peak heating season. Commissioner Wald suggested that this information be captured and communicated so people will know that this Department is making this difference. Mr. Greco reported that outreach is being conducted to the Central City SRO Collaborative, San Francisco Apartment Association, and the Professional Property Owners Association in San Francisco to target people who own multi-family properties. Mr. Broomhead stated that he is waiting for a big press event with federal level senators or Representative Pelosi to highlight these successful federal-stimulus funded activities that are creating employment opportunities. Director Nutter reported that she would include the San Francisco Boiler Incentives program in presentations she gives on Department programs.

Green Homes Assessment Program. Mr. Broomhead reported that the goal of the Green Homes Assessment program is to reach 5000 dwelling units in San Francisco, most of which are tenant-occupied. He explained that work in a residential building tends to be half labor and half materials, as opposed to commercial projects where 25% is labor, and the rest is

materials. If the intent is to create jobs, and you have $2 million to work with, you want to direct the money into residential work. While the boiler program is a terrific program, a lot of money is going into the cost of the equipment, e.g., piping, insulation, etc. There is a big labor component, but the materials component is quite large. There is more labor-intensive work and much less spent on materials when doing work in people's homes and in apartment buildings, so more money is invested in labor and work here in the city. Jobs are not being created at the manufacturing level. San Francisco does provide reports to the Department of Energy so they can report back on jobs created nationally.

Mr. Broomhead reported that in order to focus on jobs created in the city, the Department of the Environment is promoting the Green Homes Assessment and the San Francisco Home Improvement Performance programs. The Green Homes Assessment program consists of hiring people in the neighborhood to provide people with information on measures they can take to make their homes greener. There is no or a small amount of capital involved and a large amount that goes into the actual labor that is designed to create labor in the residential market. The idea of the program is to leverage existing networks in the community and strengthen them around the energy issue, develop and train a few community-based organizations, and develop those community relations so when funding runs out, there is a network already there. People in the neighborhood will know that this organization brought information to them before and can do so again. At the end of the program, organizations are able to find more funding in the form of grants.

Mr. Broomhead reported that the goal of the program is to reach 5000 homes by the end of June 2012. Five non-profit organizations have hired as many as ten people to do these assessments, and an additional training is scheduled to bring in three more organizations and train another 15-20 assessors. There is an ongoing open program for new organizations that want to get involved. To date, 700 homes have been assessed, and it is expected that the program will be complete before June 2012.

Mr. Broomhead reported on the San Francisco Green Home Assessment Survey and the Site Access Agreement to release the organization from liability. The survey covers six primary areas to inform and collect information about the building (1) emergency preparedness for earthquake; (2) safety issues; (3) energy efficiency; (4) water efficiency; (5) opportunities for gardening--raising your own food, and (6) toxics. After the assessment is complete, the assessor will have a conversation with the tenant so it becomes an educational tool, and the tenant fills out a commitment checklist of what they think they can do. The Department receives a copy and one is left for the tenant. The tenant also receives tools such as a gadget to check the hot water level, toilet leak detection kits, switch plate and outlet plate gaskets, maps of potable water in case of emergency, fire station locations, emergency centers, and emergency preparedness information from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and Red Cross.

Mr. Broomhead reported that the Department pays organizations $70 for each unit assessed. Organizations have different payment scales and are paying individual assessors by the hour or visit. Payments are provided for performance, not for outreach. A quality-assurance telephone call is made to the tenant to gather information about the visit, e.g., to see if someone arrived and length of time spent on the assessment.

Director Nutter inquired about the environmental metrics for the program. Mr. Broomhead stated that gathering metrics would require evaluation and verification of the program. One of the reasons for the commitment checklist is to evaluate what resonates with tenants. Now that approximately 10% of the program has been completed, there will be an evaluation on the 700 assessments that have been completed. Commissioner Wald inquired whether there would be verification to see if people have done what they said they were going to do. Mr. Broomhead stated this type of reporting would be unreliable, and that it would be better to measure activities that can objectively be measured, e.g. energy or water usage through a review of bills. If a reduction has been accomplished, it can be a service that non-profits can sell to people.

Commissioner Wald commended the Green Home Assessment Survey questions, but suggested tailoring the list of commitments to ones that can be measured. She stated that the safety and earthquake preparedness activities should remain because people should have an emergency kit. Mr. Broomhead stated that the state has a database for energy-efficiency retrofits, but it is not that effective because it is based on averages, and the base case does not always fit San Francisco.

San Francisco Home Improvement Performance Program (SFHIP). Mr. Broomhead reported that this program is working to stimulate contractors to make retrofits in single-family homes. He discussed funding challenges faced by this program because of financing programs that were planned but did not happen, e.g., PACE and the Home Star program. He explained that the utility program was going to provide marketing for the SFHIP program because the Department did not have funding allocated to do so, but it was delayed by a year. The utility program finally implemented a pilot program but announced they would not do much marketing for the program, so it meant that the stimulus-funded program did not have a marketing component. There were two other components that were also stimulus funded that did include marketing, but there were a lot of rules that made them difficult.

Mr. Broomhead reported that to date, there is one fully completed successful SFHIP project and a dozen being considered. He stated that contractors pressurize the house with a fan to determine if there is any leakage and whether dangerous conditions exist in the home. There is a lot that can be discovered about a home to make it a more efficient system, and more information will be available after more projects have been completed. The goal is to have worked on 400 projects by the end of June 2012. Commissioner Wald suggested that a Letter to the Editor be written on the first SFHIP successful program. Mr. Broomhead stated that he would try to organize a press event around homeowner projects.

Public Comment: Ms. Harris inquired whether the program would apply only to single-family homes. Mr. Broomhead stated that there are many condominiums and two- to four-unit buildings in San Francisco that may want to participate, but all protocols for this testing involve the entire building. You can't do just one unit and not the other unit because there is air infiltration going on between and among units. All units would have to participate. It is possible that a four unit building can receive up to $28,000 in incentives. The first $2000 would be from the Department of the Environment for the first 15% of savings, and then PG&E would provide $1500 for the first 15% of savings and $1000 for each 5% of savings increment up to

40%. Most houses will come in at 40% savings or better and would qualify for $4000 from PG&E and because they reached the 15% savings, would receive an additional $2000 from the Department of the Environment's program. If the homeowner qualifies at less than 120% of area median income, they would receive an extra $1000 from the Department's program. Mr. Broomhead reported on SFHIP marketing efforts. He handed out the Energy Upgrade California brochure that is being distributed at different locations and events throughout the city. It is expected that within a few years, there will be a state law about labeling single-family homes at time of sale that would receive a better rating if upgrades have been made. Mr. Broomhead stated that this program provides an opportunity to receive stimulus money and get improvements done in the next year. Commissioner Wald inquired about the Residential Energy Conservation Ordinance (RECO) at the time of sale. Mr. Broomhead reported that the RECO Ordinance is ineffectual at this point, and that one of the stimulus funding goals is to make policy recommendations and amendments to RECO will be considered. A report would be provided on RECO at a future Policy Committee meeting.

Mr. Broomhead stated that one of the program goals is to influence the San Francisco Board of Realtors, Planning Commission, Building Inspection, Environment Commissioners and Board of Supervisors members and families who own homes in San Francisco to make use of this program so a year from now when policy is being discussed, everyone knows what is being discussed. This program is being promoted to contractors, and there are current and new financing tools becoming available. It is also hoped that PACE financing will be reactivated, that the lawsuit will be resolved, and that there will be changes with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Mr. Broomhead stated that he would provide the Committee with program metrics once they become available. Ms. Nutter suggested that a Homes Challenge be created as part of the marketing program. It is a model that many cities are utilizing that creates the urgency and time certain by which people need to make a decision to get their home retrofit done. Mr. Broomhead stated that there are marketing plans in progress, e.g., the Department is marketing an additional $1000 for the program for applications received by the end of August and is working with Cole Hardware on a sweepstakes approach and advertising in Cole Hardware's newsletter.

Mr. Broomhead reported that San Francisco is the only local government that received funding to work with a small store retail channel to provide home energy audits and upgrades. He stated that he is awaiting the results from ACE and Lowes who have also completed a retail chain experiment with Alameda County and Recurve. He explained the difficulty with the ACE vision is that they expect contractors that participate in the program to buy all the equipment from them, but they don't provide all the materials needed for these projects. Director Nutter stated that in order to avoid roadblocks, it is important to set up a challenge that does not depend on partners.

??unclear Public Comment: Ms. Harris suggested that arrangements be made for independent hardware stores in the City to combine their purchases so they can purchase equipment at wholesale prices. She stated that Cole Hardware would be willing to advertise the program and provide publicity in their newsletter. Mr. Broomhead reported that he would be discussing the program with all hardware stores in the City in the future.

6. **Community InSight Project Update.** Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter; Staff Speakers: Director Melanie Nutter and Thea Hillman, Public Outreach Communications Manager (Explanatory Document: Community InSight Project Presentation) (Informational Presentation and Discussion)

   Director Nutter reported that the Community InSight project is an effort launched recently to engage the public in a two-way dialogue on sustainability and how San Francisco can be the greenest city. It is a project that is run by the Public Outreach program, but also has policy implications because the community is providing input on topics they would like to see the Commission address. Ms. Hillman, Public Outreach Communications Manager, was asked to present on the project.

   Ms. Hillman reported that the Community InSight project uses a combination of outreach strategies to raise awareness and encourage participation with a focus on grassroots organizing methods, community-based social marketing, and community-building strategies, supported as needed with traditional marketing strategies. In particular, there is a focus on activating existing networks within the city's communities and strengthening relationships with these networks and communities, with the ultimate goal of being part of and catalyzing two-way dialogue between the Department of the Environment and amongst members of the public.

   Ms. Hillman reported that Department staff, EnvironmentNow workers, and volunteers conduct in-person interviews to reach San Franciscans at community events that the Department is hosting or tabling. Members of the public are asked for their input to questions such as:

   - How can we help make your home and neighborhood healthier?
   - What is your vision of a sustainable San Francisco?
   - On a lighter note, what is the worst thing you've done for the environment lately? Or, what is one thing that you would do for the environment if it was easier?

   Commissioners provided their input to question 3, e.g., flying in airplanes, car not fuel-efficient, throwing away plastic containers with moldy food in the trash instead of separating the food into the compostable bin and the plastic container into the recycling bin.

   Commissioner Gravanis stated that the first question brings to mind public health, disease-free, and cleaner air, but not environmentally-sound practices. She asked how the Department can act on information received for this question if it is directed more toward public health. Ms. Hillman explained that the intent is to reach people who may be thinking about the environment in terms of health and then directing them to programs that the Department of the Environment is working on. Commissioner Wald stated that people who do not self-identify as environmentalists are oftentimes concerned with health and want to live in a healthier world. She stated that Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), an environmental organization, talks to people about health first because virtually everything that NRDC does has some sort of health component.

Ms. Hillman stated that the intent of the first question is to make connections with people who are doing environmental work and care about environmental issues, but may not talk about the environment, or they talk about the environment in terms of health. The second question brings forward the environmental term "sustainable." Commissioner Gravanis suggested broadening the first question for people that may be thinking about a related issue that would not fit in the category of health or environment, e.g., implementation of on-call garbage pick-up. Director Nutter reported that consideration has been given to changing the language to state "cleaner, greener or healthier" and then to evaluate responses to see what is working for which audience. Ms. Hillman reported that questions work differently with each medium. For example, the responses received online have been related to the environment; whereas, responses in person may be related more to another topic. It is important to think of what is being said to people where.

Ms. Hillman discussed tools and distribution methods to reach San Franciscans (Presentation Slide 3). She reported that the project launched on April 20, Earth Day, and discussed highlights and participation at the event (Presentation Slide 4). She presented on www.Ideas4SF.org, an online forum for ideas and discussed current ideas received (Presentation Slides 4-5). Staff will be responding to email ideas received by providing customized responses with links to Department of the Environment volunteer opportunities, newsletters, Facebook page, Twitter, and relevant forums.

Commissioner Gravanis suggested that staff responses include information about how to be added to the Commission meeting agenda mailing list or how to access agendas. Commissioner Wald asked that a future discussion be held on how to combine the efforts of the Community InSight project with the Commission Outreach Environmental Organization Mailing list. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that a discussion be held on utilizing this list to initiate relationships with partners and organizations.

Ms. Hillman reported on metrics for measuring the success of the project (Presentation Slide 6). She discussed the importance of reaching out to other City departments, diverse communities in San Francisco, and Commission and other networks that can be connected to the Department (Presentation Slide 7).

Public Comment: Ms. Harris asked about communication methods for people who do not have email. Ms. Hillman stated that there will be reply postcards and in-person interviews at community events and Department open-houses. Two additional community-wide events are planned before a report back on next steps will be issued in the fall.

Commissioner Prakash inquired what the response rate to direct mail has been historically. Ms. Hillman reported that the drop-off card is not currently going to be delivered by direct mail. She stated that the Department has historically seen a good response rate to direct mail about Department programs, e.g. 8 to 14% on the battery bucket campaign. The response rate depends on mailing to the right people about the right issue.

Director Nutter reported that Mayor Lee and Supervisor Avalos talked to volunteers at the Department's Sunday Streets table and provided positive feedback into the InSight campaign. Commissioner Wald suggested videoing these types of discussions. Commissioner Wald

inquired whether the Department has a list of events besides Sunday Streets. Ms. Hillman stated that Mr. Clark Hatchet, Department Volunteer Coordinator, maintains a list of events. She reported that the Department has integrated the InSight project into thirty-four events that it participated in April and will continue to do so for most activities.

Commissioner Wald inquired how people can be influenced to participate in Commission and Committee meetings through the InSight project. Should the Commission select agenda topics based on one of the more popular ideas and then tell people who are interested in the idea that a meeting will be held to discuss that topic? Ms. Hillman stated that expertise is being sought from a lot of different people in addition to the Outreach team in order to respond to some of the more relevant and popular ideas. She suggested that Committee members review ideas that may have policy history or ramifications and request that staff respond on behalf of the Committee or hold a meeting on that topic. Interested parties could be kept informed of when meetings will be held on the topic of interest and could contact the Commission to request information.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired how the Ideas4SF site would be monitored and staff time that would be required. Director Nutter reported that there are policies and rules that will be implemented that are similar to the Department's Facebook page that will keep the site transparent and monitored at the same time. Commissioner Gravanis inquired how the project would initiate relationships with community partners. Ms. Hillman reported that staff is working on a community relationship management tool database called SugarCRM that will list all organizations that the Department interacts with, kinds of relationships, and who is interacting with these organizations. Director Nutter stated that there are two elements to the partnership aspect, one is the internal element, which is the outreach list that will quantify and track interactions with the community, and the other will be to leverage strategic partnerships. She described a partnership with the California Academy of Sciences on a global warming exhibit that the Community InSight team will be involved in to promote Department programs to achieve local goals.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether there is a plan to send information about the Community InSight project to community-based groups. She suggested that this project could replace the Commission outreach survey idea. Director Nutter stated that an e-mail could be sent to the environmental organizations list to inform them that the Community InSight project has launched and request that their networks and communities be engaged and include the message to attend Commission meetings. Ms. Hillman stated that next steps will be to identify partnerships and finding ways to strengthen relationships. Commissioner Wald stated that her concern whether people will actually open an e-mail communication and take action once they do. Commissioner Prakash stated that the e-mail addresses listed in the outreach list are generic and should be expanded to identify who the communications person is. Commissioner Wald suggested stratifying the list by selecting the organizations that have something to do with the environment, have real people's names, and ones that may be interested in what the Department and Commission does. Ms. Hillman stated that some people would be reached through e-mail, while others will be reached through other communication methods.

Ms. Rosenmoss, Department of the Environment Manager of Grants and Fundraising, discussed the importance of making a personal connection to the success of the program. She stated that

the information that will be received will ultimately be coming mostly from Department contacts and people who recognize the Department's name.

Mr. Greco, Department of the Environment Energy team, suggested advertising the project in newspapers such as the San Francisco Examiner or the San Francisco Bay Guardian. Ms. Hillman stated that the intent is to talk to people about the issues they care about, but not spend a lot of money on advertising. She stated that a partnership with newspapers could be constructive with the idea that they would support the project by helping the public share ideas. Commissioner Prakash suggested finding someone in the newspaper that would be willing to write about the project.

Commissioner Wald suggested requesting that City departments mention the project in their outgoing mail communication. Ms. Hillman suggested that City departments add a link to the Department's interview page. Mr. Greco suggested adding links to the survey on other organization websites, e.g., the DeYoung Museum. Commissioner Wald suggested that strategic partners be included as well. Commissioner Prakash suggested influencing more people to join and send messages about the project through Facebook and social networking in order to get more traction. Commissioner Wald suggested asking a company to promote this effort through some incentive that is being offered. Ms. Hillman reported that Twitter has asked that the Department become involved in a recycling campaign specific to their company.

Commissioner Gravanis asked how the project is being funded. Director Nutter reported that it is being funded through part of the outreach team budget, which comes from the Impound Account. Additional sources of funding are also being sought.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel stated that (1) consideration should be given to not violating the privacy policy when sending communication to e-mail addresses; (2) a discussion should be held on alternate methods of engaging organizations other than e-mail; (3) in terms of this project, share the top five new ideas every month with the Commission Policy Committee to identify whether topics should be heard at Committee meetings or should be referred to other venues; (4) managing expectations is important because the Department does want new ideas that there is no existing avenue for, but the idea that every issue will be followed-up on or acted on is not feasible because there may not be resources available to do so.

Public Comment: Ms. Harris suggested publishing in a monthly newsletter the five top ideas and five worst things that could happen to keep the public up-to-date about what has been received from them and what they can do about it. Commissioner Wald suggested that these ideas should also be published on the website. It is important that people be communicated with through the forum that they have provided their ideas through.

Commissioner Prakash stated that your most passionate users are going to stop using the site or providing information unless they see actions or policy being implemented as a result of ideas being provided. Director Nutter explained that the campaign is in its beginning stages, and next steps will be to discuss what to commit to and what the process will be for showing results. Commissioner Wald stated that in order to achieve goals, it is important to identify early on in the process where the time is going to come from and staff responsible.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel discussed the importance of highlighting the people who have provided the ideas as well as for the Department to provide a response to those ideas. He stated that it is beneficial that people view the Department and the City as responsive to its ideas.

Director Nutter thanked the Community InSight project leaders and everyone who worked on this project.

7. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** Sponsor: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Monica Fish, Commission Secretary (Explanatory Documents: Memo to Policy Committee and Commission Outreach Draft List) (Informational Report and Discussion)

   This agenda item was continued to the June 13, 2011 Policy Committee meeting.

8. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

   Director Nutter introduced Ms. Lauren Lester, Management Assistant. She reported on her attendance at two conferences: (1) "Cities Behavior Change and Climate" where she presented or the Department's Zero Waste program; and (2) "Creating Climate Health" to discuss innovative financing mechanisms for large-scale energy efficiency projects for cities and the possibility of funding large scale projects in San Francisco.

   Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel reported that the Economic Analysis Report was published on the Yellow Pages legislation which is before the Board of Supervisors on May 10, 2011.

9. **Announcements.** (Discussion)

   Director Nutter reported that the Green Economy and Green Jobs Forum that is sponsored by the Department of the Environment and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development is scheduled for May 25. Commissioners would be provided with more information and an invitation to attend.

10. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)

    Commissioner Wald stated that the June 13 meeting would include a discussion on the Community InSight project, the Draft Environmental Organization Outreach list, and an update on America's Cup. Director Nutter reported that a cell phone update would be scheduled for a future meeting. Commissioner Gravanis asked that Mr. Westlund, Program Outreach Manager, prioritize work on an Ordinance to ban balloon releases.

    Commissioner Gravanis asked that the Committee discuss how to provide guidance and influence over America's Cup activities to make sure that restrictions are in place and vendors will not sell single-serve water bottles. She suggested that staff work with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission on supplying water supply infrastructure to main spectator areas and consider issuing a bid for service providers of jug fillers. Commissioner Wald suggested holding a multi-departmental meeting to discuss these issues. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that staff hold the initial conversation and then determine if someone should be invited to a Committee meeting.

Director Nutter reported there are a lot of interdepartmental working groups already meeting at the staff level about America's Cup. The Department of the Environment and America's Cup Organizing Committee are hiring a consultant who will be working on the Sustainability Plan over the next six to eight weeks. She stated that there will not likely be a working draft available at the next Committee meeting for the Commission to review, but suggested that a prioritized list be presented to the consultant midway through their work so that the Commission's top priorities and points of interest can be incorporated. She stated that a draft document may be available in approximately two months that will reflect these priorities and points of interest for the Committee to review. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that the Committee comment on the Zero Waste Plan in the meantime. Commissioner Wald suggested a discussion at the June 13 Committee meeting on issues that the Committee would like to make sure is incorporated into the Plan.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel asked that potential future agenda items be added to future editions of agendas for public information. Commissioner Wald stated that this suggestion is being considered.

1. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

2. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary,
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 13, 2011at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

* Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee with each set of minutes, or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org.

Approved:

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

JUN 14 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

MONDAY, MAY 9, 2011, 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL, ROOM 421

ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

OMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul rakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:00 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald, Gravanis and Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the April 18, 2011 Policy Committee Rescheduled Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: April 18, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Prakash, the April 18, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Commissioners Wald, Gravanis and Prakash).

   Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel commended the Commission Secretary on the meeting minutes.

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

em 6 was heard before Items 4-5. Item 5 was heard before Item 4.

4. **Update on Pharmaceutical Waste Initiatives.** Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter; Staff Speaker: Caitlin Sanders, Toxics Reduction Program Associate (Informational Report and Discussion)

Ms. Sanders reported on her work setting up programs for residents to make it easier to dispose of household hazardous waste. She stated that disposal of pharmaceuticals has been worked on for a long time, and a lot has happened since Ms. Zarrehparvar issued a report to the Committee back in 2009 discussing (1) the United States Geological Survey study on pharmaceutical contamination of water bodies; and (2) barriers to running collection programs due to funding, and a federal law that prohibits anyone other than law enforcement to collect controlled substances.

Ms. Sanders provided a history of San Francisco's previous attempts at setting up collection programs. The Household Hazardous Waste facility had collected pharmaceuticals for approximately fifteen years, but due to concerns about not being able to filter out controls, they stopped the program. There have been one-day citywide collection events at law enforcement agencies in partnership with the Drug Enforcement Agency and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. Back in 2006 there was a temporary three-day pharmacy collection event at Walgreens. There was a brief period where Pharmaca, a pharmacy in Cole Valley, partnered with the Department of the Environment, but also dropped out of the program because of concerns with not being able to filter out controls.

In 2010, Supervisor Mirkarimi consulted with the Department of the Environment for new ideas for legislation. In order to resolve the funding barrier as well as the Drug Enforcement Agency's law, one idea and solution presented was Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) for pharmaceuticals. Supervisor Mirkarimi worked with the California Product Stewardship Council to draft an Ordinance that was introduced in 2010, but did not come back until six months later in October when it was approved by the Public Safety Committee with a 2-1 vote. At the full Board meeting, the pharmaceutical manufacturers expressed their concern with the legislation, lobbied, and denied responsibility for this waste stream. It became apparent that the argument was a weak one. The next avenue was for the pharmaceutical industry to request a more reasonable stakeholder process where collaborative approaches were considered rather than an ordinance to develop and implement their own collection program only in the city San Francisco.

The ordinance was postponed for about four weeks, and a series of meetings were held with representatives from the pharmaceutical industry, McKesson, Genentech, biotech companies, Safeway and Walgreens. It became apparent that whether or not the Ordinance moved forward, something needed to be done. The pharmaceutical industry offered funding for a pilot collection program and to work on this collaborative approach. Pharma, the trade association for pharmaceutical manufacturers offered $100,000 and Genentech offered $10,000. Since then, work has been in progress to flesh out the details of the program.

The Department wanted to involve Walgreens since it has partnership programs with them to collect batteries and cell phones, but they chose not to participate in the program. In the past few weeks, 17 of 26 local independent pharmaceutical companies have signed on to run a collection program that will kick off in August. In addition, five police stations have decided to

participate in order to collect controlled substances. Pharmacies were selected as the most logical place to collect pharmaceuticals because lots of calls from the public to the Department on this topic were referred by pharmacies since people went there first to try to dispose of their drugs. Ms. Sanders reported that out of the eleven supervisory districts, nine of them have independent pharmacies in them and out of those nine districts there is one pharmacy for each participating. Ms. Sanders reported that Pharmaca opted not to participate at this time because they are following the example of Walgreens and other competitors.

Ms. Sanders reported that since the Pharmaca collection stopped in the last couple of years, the Department of the Environment has been running a pilot program offering pharmaceutical collection envelopes to the public, but not a lot of outreach has been done around this program because the envelopes cost the Department $3.75 a piece. At the same time, some type of solution was needed because of the number of calls received, so these envelopes were offered to the public for free, but now they are sold at Walgreens, Kaiser and Safeway. That may be the number one motivation why Walgreens does not want to participate because they have a financial incentive as an alternative.

Ms. Sanders reported that another ordinance introduced by Supervisor Mirkarimi that has to do with the pharmaceutical program is being discussed at the Small Business Commission this evening. Once the Extended Producer Responsibility Ordinance was tabled, an alternative Ordinance was introduced that requires all stores in San Francisco that sell pharmaceuticals to advertise where people can safely dispose of pharmaceutical waste. The Department of the Environment is in charge of developing regulations determining what the materials will look like and for enforcement if the Ordinance is approved.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether doctors that are prescribers of pharmaceuticals could be involved in the collection program. Ms. Sanders reported that doctors' offices and clinics have their own reverse distribution systems where they can reverse distribute the drugs back to the pharmaceutical manufacturers; however, there are contamination concerns about taking back expired or unwanted medications. Doctors and clinics are not typically distributing pharmaceuticals, so a pharmacy would be the more logical place where a resident would go back to. Commissioner Wald stated that lots of people get their medicines through mail order companies not located in San Francisco, so doctors could be encouraged to tell people when they write a prescription where to dispose of pharmaceutical waste through a handout of some sort or a sticker. She suggested that stickers be considered so people do not keep calling the department for disposal instructions. Ms. Sanders stated that there is $50,000 that has been budgeted to outreach that has allowed for outreach at some clinics and that she would bring this idea to Outreach staff.

Ms. Sanders reported that in November 2010, a new federal law was passed that gives the Attorney General the power to rewrite regulations to allow places other than law enforcement agencies to collect controlled substances. It is to be determined what those regulations will be, but it will most likely allow places such as clinics, hospice facilities and senior homes to collect as well. Commissioner Prakash stated that it makes sense to work with the larger medical groups in San Francisco rather than clinics that have only a few doctors. Commissioner Wald stated that these medical groups hold meetings every month and suggested that staff attend a meeting.

5. **San Francisco Home Improvement and Performance (SFHIP) and Green Home Assessment Program Updates.** Staff Speakers: Cal Broomhead, Energy Manager and Matt Greco, San Francisco Boiler Systems Incentives Program Manager (Explanatory Documents: San Francisco Boiler Systems Incentive Program and Green Homes Assessment Survey) (Informational Report and Discussion)

San Francisco Boiler Incentives Program. Mr. Matt Greco reported that this program targets inefficient boilers and associated heating equipment in multi-family and Single Room Occupancy (SRO) properties in San Francisco. It is a successful program launched in July of last year that is funded by the federal stimulus bill. To date, 122 project applications have been received, 95 of which are complete, and nearly $2 million worth of work has been leveraged. This program creates jobs in San Francisco. Its main purpose is to replace old boilers in multi-family properties that were built in the 1920's and 1930's, many of which are original boilers, with new energy-efficient low pressure steam boilers and hydronic heating and domestic water boilers.

Public Comment: Ms. Lurilla Harris inquired whether solar in included in this program. Mr. Broomhead explained that solar is not part of the program.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether there is a formula for estimating the savings from converting the old boilers to new ones. Mr. Greco reported that the California Energy Commission hired a consultant who developed a Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS) that contains statewide and utility specific results. It includes data on all residential appliances, equipment and general usage habits for space heating, domestic hot water use, lights, refrigeration, etc. This program utilizes various equations using this data in the baseline of existing equipment efficiency, which sometimes is assumed, and the new measure for new equipment efficiency, and based on that data, therm usage can be projected.

Mr. Greco reported that one customer during the peak heating season is saving $500 a month on his energy bill on a 34-unit building. The cost to replace this boiler, which was capsulated with asbestos, was $28,000. A local boiler contractor did the work, and the Department of the Environment program incentivized about $7000 of that project. In addition, he is receiving the $500 a month savings during the peak heating season. Commissioner Wald suggested that this information be captured and communicated so people will know that this Department is making this difference. Mr. Greco reported that outreach is being conducted to the Central City SRO Collaborative, San Francisco Apartment Association, and the Professional Property Owners Association in San Francisco to target people who own multi-family properties. Mr. Broomhead stated that he is waiting for a big press event with federal level senators or Representative Pelosi to highlight these successful federal-stimulus funded activities that are creating employment opportunities. Director Nutter reported that she would include the San Francisco Boiler Incentives program in presentations she gives on Department programs.

Green Homes Assessment Program. Mr. Broomhead reported that the goal of the Green Homes Assessment program is to reach 5000 dwelling units in San Francisco, most of which are tenant-occupied. He explained that work in a residential building tends to be half labor and half materials, as opposed to commercial projects where 25% is labor, and the rest is

materials. If the intent is to create jobs, and you have $2 million to work with, you want to direct the money into residential work. While the boiler program is a terrific program, a lot of money is going into the cost of the equipment, e.g., piping, insulation, etc. There is a big labor component, but the materials component is quite large. There is more labor-intensive work and much less spent on materials when doing work in people's homes and in apartment buildings, so more money is invested in labor and work here in the city. Jobs are not being created at the manufacturing level. San Francisco does provide reports to the Department of Energy so they can report back on jobs created nationally.

Mr. Broomhead reported that in order to focus on jobs created in the city, the Department of the Environment is promoting the Green Homes Assessment and the San Francisco Home Improvement Performance programs. The Green Homes Assessment program consists of hiring people in the neighborhood to provide people with information on measures they can take to make their homes greener. There is no or a small amount of capital involved and a large amount that goes into the actual labor that is designed to create labor in the residential market. The idea of the program is to leverage existing networks in the community and strengthen them around the energy issue, develop and train a few community-based organizations, and develop those community relations so when funding runs out, there is a network already there. People in the neighborhood will know that this organization brought information to them before and can do so again. At the end of the program, organizations are able to find more funding in the form of grants.

Mr. Broomhead reported that the goal of the program is to reach 5000 homes by the end of June 2012. Five non-profit organizations have hired as many as ten people to do these assessments, and an additional training is scheduled to bring in three more organizations and train another 15-20 assessors. There is an ongoing open program for new organizations that want to get involved. To date, 700 homes have been assessed, and it is expected that the program will be complete before June 2012.

Mr. Broomhead reported on the San Francisco Green Home Assessment Survey and the Site Access Agreement to release the organization from liability. The survey covers six primary areas to inform and collect information about the building (1) emergency preparedness for earthquake; (2) safety issues; (3) energy efficiency; (4) water efficiency; (5) opportunities for gardening--raising your own food, and (6) toxics. After the assessment is complete, the assessor will have a conversation with the tenant so it becomes an educational tool, and the tenant fills out a commitment checklist of what they think they can do. The Department receives a copy and one is left for the tenant. The tenant also receives tools such as a gadget to check the hot water level, toilet leak detection kits, switch plate and outlet plate gaskets, maps of potable water in case of emergency, fire station locations, emergency centers, and emergency preparedness information from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and Red Cross.

Mr. Broomhead reported that the Department pays organizations $70 for each unit assessed. Organizations have different payment scales and are paying individual assessors by the hour or visit. Payments are provided for performance, not for outreach. A quality-assurance telephone call is made to the tenant to gather information about the visit, e.g., to see if someone arrived and length of time spent on the assessment.

Director Nutter inquired about the environmental metrics for the program. Mr. Broomhead stated that gathering metrics would require evaluation and verification of the program. One of the reasons for the commitment checklist is to evaluate what resonates with tenants. Now tha approximately 10% of the program has been completed, there will be an evaluation on the 70(assessments that have been completed. Commissioner Wald inquired whether there would b verification to see if people have done what they said they were going to do. Mr. Broomhead stated this type of reporting would be unreliable, and that it would be better to measure activities that can objectively be measured, e.g. energy or water usage through a review of bills. If a reduction has been accomplished, it can be a service that non-profits can sell to people.

Commissioner Wald commended the Green Home Assessment Survey questions, but suggested tailoring the list of commitments to ones that can be measured. She stated that the safety and earthquake preparedness activities should remain because people should have an emergency kit. Mr. Broomhead stated that the state has a database for energy-efficiency retrofits, but it is not that effective because it is based on averages, and the base case does not always fit San Francisco.

San Francisco Home Improvement Performance Program (SFHIP). Mr. Broomhead reported that this program is working to stimulate contractors to make retrofits in single-family homes. He discussed funding challenges faced by this program because of financing programs that were planned but did not happen, e.g., PACE and the Home Star program. He explained that the utility program was going to provide marketing for the SFHIP program because the Department did not have funding allocated to do so, but it was delayed by a year. The utility program finally implemented a pilot program but announced they would not do much marketing for the program, so it meant that the stimulus-funded program did not have a marketing component. There were two other components that were also stimulus funded that did include marketing, but there were a lot of rules that made them difficult.

Mr. Broomhead reported that to date, there is one fully completed successful SFHIP project and a dozen being considered. He stated that contractors pressurize the house with a fan to determine if there is any leakage and whether dangerous conditions exist in the home. There is a lot that can be discovered about a home to make it a more efficient system, and more information will be available after more projects have been completed. The goal is to have worked on 400 projects by the end of June 2012. Commissioner Wald suggested that a Letter to the Editor be written on the first SFHIP successful program. Mr. Broomhead stated that he would try to organize a press event around homeowner projects.

Public Comment: Ms. Harris inquired whether the program would apply only to single-family homes. Mr. Broomhead stated that there are many condominiums and two- to four-unit buildings in San Francisco that may want to participate, but all protocols for this testing involve the entire building. You can't do just one unit and not the other unit because there is air infiltration going on between and among units. All units would have to participate. It is possible that a four unit building can receive up to $28,000 in incentives. The first $2000 would be from the Department of the Environment for the first 15% of savings, and then PG&E would provide $1500 for the first 15% of savings and $1000 for each 5% of savings increment up to

40%. Most houses will come in at 40% savings or better and would qualify for $4000 from PG&E and because they reached the 15% savings, would receive an additional $2000 from the Department of the Environment's program. If the homeowner qualifies at less than 120% of area median income, they would receive an extra $1000 from the Department's program. Mr. Broomhead reported on SFHIP marketing efforts. He handed out the Energy Upgrade California brochure that is being distributed at different locations and events throughout the city. It is expected that within a few years, there will be a state law about labeling single-family homes at time of sale that would receive a better rating if upgrades have been made. Mr. Broomhead stated that this program provides an opportunity to receive stimulus money and get improvements done in the next year. Commissioner Wald inquired about the Residential Energy Conservation Ordinance (RECO) at the time of sale. Mr. Broomhead reported that the RECO Ordinance is ineffectual at this point, and that one of the stimulus funding goals is to make policy recommendations and amendments to RECO will be considered. A report would be provided on RECO at a future Policy Committee meeting.

Mr. Broomhead stated that one of the program goals is to influence the San Francisco Board of Realtors, Planning Commission, Building Inspection, Environment Commissioners and Board of Supervisors members and families who own homes in San Francisco to make use of this program so a year from now when policy is being discussed, everyone knows what is being discussed. This program is being promoted to contractors, and there are current and new financing tools becoming available. It is also hoped that PACE financing will be reactivated, that the lawsuit will be resolved, and that there will be changes with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Mr. Broomhead stated that he would provide the Committee with program metrics once they become available. Ms. Nutter suggested that a Homes Challenge be created as part of the marketing program. It is a model that many cities are utilizing that creates the urgency and time certain by which people need to make a decision to get their home retrofit done. Mr. Broomhead stated that there are marketing plans in progress, e.g., the Department is marketing an additional $1000 for the program for applications received by the end of August and is working with Cole Hardware on a sweepstakes approach and advertising in Cole Hardware's newsletter.

Mr. Broomhead reported that San Francisco is the only local government that received funding to work with a small store retail channel to provide home energy audits and upgrades. He stated that he is awaiting the results from ACE and Lowes who have also completed a retail chain experiment with Alameda County and Recurve. He explained the difficulty with the ACE vision is that they expect contractors that participate in the program to buy all the equipment from them, but they don't provide all the materials needed for these projects. Director Nutter stated that in order to avoid roadblocks, it is important to set up a challenge that does not depend on partners.

Unclear--Public Comment: Ms. Harris suggested that arrangements be made for independent hardware stores in the City to combine their purchases so they can purchase equipment at wholesale prices. She stated that Cole Hardware would be willing to advertise the program and provide publicity in their newsletter. Mr. Broomhead reported that he would be discussing the program with all hardware stores in the City in the future.

6. **Community InSight Project Update.** Sponsor: Director Melanie Nutter; Staff Speakers: Director Melanie Nutter and Thea Hillman, Public Outreach Communications Manager (Explanatory Document: Community InSight Project Presentation) (Informational Presentation and Discussion)

   Director Nutter reported that the Community InSight project is an effort launched recently to engage the public in a two-way dialogue on sustainability and how San Francisco can be the greenest city. It is a project that is run by the Public Outreach program, but also has policy implications because the community is providing input on topics they would like to see the Commission address. Ms. Hillman, Public Outreach Communications Manager, was asked to present on the project.

   Ms. Hillman reported that the Community InSight project uses a combination of outreach strategies to raise awareness and encourage participation with a focus on grassroots organizing methods, community-based social marketing, and community-building strategies, supported as needed with traditional marketing strategies. In particular, there is a focus on activating existing networks within the city's communities and strengthening relationships with these networks and communities, with the ultimate goal of being part of and catalyzing two-way dialogue between the Department of the Environment and amongst members of the public.

   Ms. Hillman reported that Department staff, EnvironmentNow workers, and volunteers conduct in-person interviews to reach San Franciscans at community events that the Department is hosting or tabling. Members of the public are asked for their input to questions such as:

   - How can we help make your home and neighborhood healthier?
   - What is your vision of a sustainable San Francisco?
   - On a lighter note, what is the worst thing you've done for the environment lately? Or, what is one thing that you would do for the environment if it was easier?

Commissioners provided their input to question 3, e.g., flying in airplanes, car not fuel-efficient, throwing away plastic containers with moldy food in the trash instead of separating the food into the compostable bin and the plastic container into the recycling bin.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that the first question brings to mind public health, disease-free, and cleaner air, but not environmentally-sound practices. She asked how the Department can act on information received for this question if it is directed more toward public health. Ms. Hillman explained that the intent is to reach people who may be thinking about the environment in terms of health and then directing them to programs that the Department of the Environment is working on. Commissioner Wald stated that people who do not self-identify as environmentalists are oftentimes concerned with health and want to live in a healthier world. She stated that Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), an environmental organization, talks to people about health first because virtually everything that NRDC does has some sort of health component.

Ms. Hillman stated that the intent of the first question is to make connections with people who are doing environmental work and care about environmental issues, but may not talk about the environment, or they talk about the environment in terms of health. The second question brings forward the environmental term "sustainable." Commissioner Gravanis suggested broadening the first question for people that may be thinking about a related issue that would not fit in the category of health or environment, e.g., implementation of on-call garbage pick-up. Director Nutter reported that consideration has been given to changing the language to state "cleaner, greener or healthier" and then to evaluate responses to see what is working for which audience. Ms. Hillman reported that questions work differently with each medium. For example, the responses received online have been related to the environment; whereas, responses in person may be related more to another topic. It is important to think of what is being said to people where.

Ms. Hillman discussed tools and distribution methods to reach San Franciscans (Presentation Slide 3). She reported that the project launched on April 20, Earth Day, and discussed highlights and participation at the event (Presentation Slide 4). She presented on www.Ideas4SF.org, an online forum for ideas and discussed current ideas received (Presentation Slides 4-5). Staff will be responding to email ideas received by providing customized responses with links to Department of the Environment volunteer opportunities, newsletters, Facebook page, Twitter, and relevant forums.

Commissioner Gravanis suggested that staff responses include information about how to be added to the Commission meeting agenda mailing list or how to access agendas. Commissioner Wald asked that a future discussion be held on how to combine the efforts of the Community InSight project with the Commission Outreach Environmental Organization Mailing list. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that a discussion be held on utilizing this list to initiate relationships with partners and organizations.

Ms. Hillman reported on metrics for measuring the success of the project (Presentation Slide 6). She discussed the importance of reaching out to other City departments, diverse communities in San Francisco, and Commission and other networks that can be connected to the Department (Presentation Slide 7).

Public Comment: Ms. Harris asked about communication methods for people who do not have email. Ms. Hillman stated that there will be reply postcards and in-person interviews at community events and Department open-houses. Two additional community-wide events are planned before a report back on next steps will be issued in the fall.

Commissioner Prakash inquired what the response rate to direct mail has been historically. Ms. Hillman reported that the drop-off card is not currently going to be delivered by direct mail. She stated that the Department has historically seen a good response rate to direct mail about Department programs, e.g. 8 to 14% on the battery bucket campaign. The response rate depends on mailing to the right people about the right issue.

Director Nutter reported that Mayor Lee and Supervisor Avalos talked to volunteers at the Department's Sunday Streets table and provided positive feedback into the InSight campaign. Commissioner Wald suggested videoing these types of discussions. Commissioner Wald

inquired whether the Department has a list of events besides Sunday Streets. Ms. Hillman stated that Mr. Clark Hatchet, Department Volunteer Coordinator, maintains a list of events. She reported that the Department has integrated the InSight project into thirty-four events that it participated in April and will continue to do so for most activities.

Commissioner Wald inquired how people can be influenced to participate in Commission and Committee meetings through the InSight project. Should the Commission select agenda topics based on one of the more popular ideas and then tell people who are interested in the idea that a meeting will be held to discuss that topic? Ms. Hillman stated that expertise is being sought from a lot of different people in addition to the Outreach team in order to respond to some of the more relevant and popular ideas. She suggested that Committee members review ideas that may have policy history or ramifications and request that staff respond on behalf of the Committee or hold a meeting on that topic. Interested parties could be kept informed of when meetings will be held on the topic of interest and could contact the Commission to request information.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired how the Ideas4SF site would be monitored and staff time that would be required. Director Nutter reported that there are policies and rules that will be implemented that are similar to the Department's Facebook page that will keep the site transparent and monitored at the same time. Commissioner Gravanis inquired how the project would initiate relationships with community partners. Ms. Hillman reported that staff is working on a community relationship management tool database called SugarCRM that will list all organizations that the Department interacts with, kinds of relationships, and who is interacting with these organizations. Director Nutter stated that there are two elements to the partnership aspect, one is the internal element, which is the outreach list that will quantify and track interactions with the community, and the other will be to leverage strategic partnerships. She described a partnership with the California Academy of Sciences on a global warming exhibit that the Community InSight team will be involved in to promote Department programs to achieve local goals.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether there is a plan to send information about the Community InSight project to community-based groups. She suggested that this project could replace the Commission outreach survey idea. Director Nutter stated that an e-mail could be sent to the environmental organizations list to inform them that the Community InSight project has launched and request that their networks and communities be engaged and include the message to attend Commission meetings. Ms. Hillman stated that next steps will be to identify partnerships and finding ways to strengthen relationships. Commissioner Wald stated that her concern whether people will actually open an e-mail communication and take action once they do. Commissioner Prakash stated that the e-mail addresses listed in the outreach list are generic and should be expanded to identify who the communications person is. Commissioner Wald suggested stratifying the list by selecting the organizations that have something to do with the environment, have real people's names, and ones that may be interested in what the Department and Commission does. Ms. Hillman stated that some people would be reached through e-mail, while others will be reached through other communication methods.

Ms. Rosenmoss, Department of the Environment Manager of Grants and Fundraising, discussed the importance of making a personal connection to the success of the program. She stated that

the information that will be received will ultimately be coming mostly from Department contacts and people who recognize the Department's name.

Mr. Greco, Department of the Environment Energy team, suggested advertising the project in newspapers such as the San Francisco Examiner or the San Francisco Bay Guardian. Ms. Hillman stated that the intent is to talk to people about the issues they care about, but not spend a lot of money on advertising. She stated that a partnership with newspapers could be constructive with the idea that they would support the project by helping the public share ideas. Commissioner Prakash suggested finding someone in the newspaper that would be willing to write about the project.

Commissioner Wald suggested requesting that City departments mention the project in their outgoing mail communication. Ms. Hillman suggested that City departments add a link to the Department's interview page. Mr. Greco suggested adding links to the survey on other organization websites, e.g., the DeYoung Museum. Commissioner Wald suggested that strategic partners be included as well. Commissioner Prakash suggested influencing more people to join and send messages about the project through Facebook and social networking in order to get more traction. Commissioner Wald suggested asking a company to promote this effort through some incentive that is being offered. Ms. Hillman reported that Twitter has asked that the Department become involved in a recycling campaign specific to their company.

Commissioner Gravanis asked how the project is being funded. Director Nutter reported that it is being funded through part of the outreach team budget, which comes from the Impound Account. Additional sources of funding are also being sought.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel stated that (1) consideration should be given to not violating the privacy policy when sending communication to e-mail addresses; (2) a discussion should be held on alternate methods of engaging organizations other than e-mail; (3) in terms of this project, share the top five new ideas every month with the Commission Policy Committee to identify whether topics should be heard at Committee meetings or should be referred to other venues; (4) managing expectations is important because the Department does want new ideas that there is no existing avenue for, but the idea that every issue will be followed-up on or acted on is not feasible because there may not be resources available to do so.

Public Comment: Ms. Harris suggested publishing in a monthly newsletter the five top ideas and five worst things that could happen to keep the public up-to-date about what has been received from them and what they can do about it. Commissioner Wald suggested that these ideas should also be published on the website. It is important that people be communicated with through the forum that they have provided their ideas through.

Commissioner Prakash stated that your most passionate users are going to stop using the site or providing information unless they see actions or policy being implemented as a result of ideas being provided. Director Nutter explained that the campaign is in its beginning stages, and next steps will be to discuss what to commit to and what the process will be for showing results. Commissioner Wald stated that in order to achieve goals, it is important to identify early on in the process where the time is going to come from and staff responsible.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel discussed the importance of highlighting the people who have provided the ideas as well as for the Department to provide a response to those ideas. He stated that it is beneficial that people view the Department and the City as responsive to its ideas.

Director Nutter thanked the Community InSight project leaders and everyone who worked on this project.

7. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** Sponsor: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Monica Fish, Commission Secretary (Explanatory Documents: Memo to Policy Committee and Commission Outreach Draft List) (Informational Report and Discussion)

   This agenda item was continued to the June 13, 2011 Policy Committee meeting.

8. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

   Director Nutter introduced Ms. Lauren Lester, Management Assistant. She reported on her attendance at two conferences: (1) "Cities Behavior Change and Climate" where she presented on the Department's Zero Waste program; and (2) "Creating Climate Health" to discuss innovative financing mechanisms for large-scale energy efficiency projects for cities and the possibility of funding large scale projects in San Francisco.

   Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel reported that the Economic Analysis Report was published on the Yellow Pages legislation which is before the Board of Supervisors on May 10, 2011.

9. **Announcements.** (Discussion)

   Director Nutter reported that the Green Economy and Green Jobs Forum that is sponsored by the Department of the Environment and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development is scheduled for May 25. Commissioners would be provided with more information and an invitation to attend.

10. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)

    Commissioner Wald stated that the June 13 meeting would include a discussion on the Community InSight project, the Draft Environmental Organization Outreach list, and an update on America's Cup. Director Nutter reported that a cell phone update would be scheduled for a future meeting. Commissioner Gravanis asked that Mr. Westlund, Program Outreach Manager, prioritize work on an Ordinance to ban balloon releases.

    Commissioner Gravanis asked that the Committee discuss how to provide guidance and influence over America's Cup activities to make sure that restrictions are in place and vendors will not sell single-serve water bottles. She suggested that staff work with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission on supplying water supply infrastructure to main spectator areas and consider issuing a bid for service providers of jug fillers. Commissioner Wald suggested holding a multi-departmental meeting to discuss these issues. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that staff hold the initial conversation and then determine if someone should be invited to a Committee meeting.

Director Nutter reported there are a lot of interdepartmental working groups already meeting at the staff level about America's Cup. The Department of the Environment and America's Cup Organizing Committee are hiring a consultant who will be working on the Sustainability Plan over the next six to eight weeks. She stated that there will not likely be a working draft available at the next Committee meeting for the Commission to review, but suggested that a prioritized list be presented to the consultant midway through their work so that the Commission's top priorities and points of interest can be incorporated. She stated that a draft document may be available in approximately two months that will reflect these priorities and points of interest for the Committee to review. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that the Committee comment on the Zero Waste Plan in the meantime. Commissioner Wald suggested a discussion at the June 13 Committee meeting on issues that the Committee would like to make sure is incorporated into the Plan.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel asked that potential future agenda items be added to future editions of agendas for public information. Commissioner Wald stated that this suggestion is being considered.

1. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

2. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary,
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 13, 2011at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee with each set of minutes, or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org.

Approved: June 13, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

JUN - 7 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING AND AGENDA
MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOOLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS
Public comment will be taken before the Committee takes action on any item.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.**
2. **Approval of Minutes of the May 9, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: May 9, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)
3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
4. **America's Cup Event Sustainability Planning Update** Sponsor: Melanie Nutter, Director; Speaker: Kelly Runyon, Environmental Science Associates (ESA) (30 minutes) (Informational Report and Discussion)
5. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Continued from the May 9, 2011 Meeting) Sponsor: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Monica Fish, Commission Secretary (5 minutes) (Explanatory Document: Memo to Policy Committee and Commission Outreach Draft List) (Informational Report and Discussion)
6. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)
7. **Announcements.** (Discussion)
8. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)
9. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
10. **Adjournment.**

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary, Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, July 11, 2011at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee , or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org within three business days of a meeting. If any materials related to an item o this agenda have been distributed to the Commission Policy Committee after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Department of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 during normal office hours or will be made available at the Policy Committee meeting website link https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee as attachments included with the agenda or meeting minutes.

Important Information

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices ar prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from th meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or othe similar sound-producing electronic devices.

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the Committee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Committee members. Any written comments should be sent to: Commission Secretary of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Comments which cannot be delivered to the Commission Secretary by that time may be taken directly to the hearing at the location above. When bringing handouts to meetings, please photocopy on both sides of the paper and try to use post-consumer recycled or tree-free paper. Also, please bring sufficient copies of handouts for the Committee, the Commission Secretary and the public.

Public Comment

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are withi the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but are not on today's agenda. Public comment wi be taken following each agendized item. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes, unless otherwise announced by the Chair. If it is demonstrated that the comments
by the public will exceed 15 minutes, the Chair may continue Public Comment to another time during the meeting.

The Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue no appearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In response to public comment, not on an agendized item, the Committee is limited to:

1. Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
2. Request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
3. Directing staff to place the item or issue on a future agenda (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Disability Access

The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meeting will be held at City Hall, Room 421, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, in the Civic Center area. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the Civic Center Station at United Nations Plaza and Market Street. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro Stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For information about MUNI accessible services call (415) 923-6142. There is accessible curbside parking adjacent to City Hall on Grove Street and Van Ness Avenue and in the vicinity of the Veterans Building at 401 Van Ness Avenue adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: for American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Monica Fish at (415) 355-3709 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call the Mayor's Office on Disability at (415) 554-6789 or (415) 554-6799 (TTY) for further information.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance
(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Sunshine Task Force Administrator, City Hall, Room 409, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683 at Phone No.: (415) 554-7724; Fax No.: (415) 554-7854; E-mail: stf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3112; web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Posted: June 7, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES
MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 29 2011
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:02 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Excused: Commissioner Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the May 9, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: May 9, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the May 9, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection. (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash).

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. Ms. Maria D'Agostino discussed her concerns expressed today at the Board of Supervisors City Operations and Neighborhood Services Committee meeting on the Department of Public Work's (DPW) Sidewalk Tree Maintenance Relinquishment Plan to adjacent property owners. She stated that she spoke at that meeting as a concerned citizen and not in her capacity as Chair of the Urban Forestry Council. Ms. D'Agostino discussed her background as a certified arborist, certified municipal specialist, certified

tree risk assessor, former volunteer and employee for Friends of the Urban Forest, former employee of the City and County of San Francisco Bureau of Urban Forestry, and urban forester for the City of Redwood City. Ms. D'Agostino provided examples c poor maintenance performed by private property owners and expressed her concern with this Plan and the health and safety of our urban forest as it relates to planting, establishing, maintaining, and enhancing our urban forest canopy. Relinquishing without a proper education program and without any idea of private property owner resources to take on these responsibilities is not a good idea. The Urban Forestry Council's Planning and Funding Committee will be discussing this topic at its June 16 meeting at 4:15 p.m. City Hall, Room 421.

4. **America's Cup Event Sustainability Planning Update** Sponsor: Melanie Nutter, Director Speaker: Kelly Runyon, Senior Engineer, Environmental Science Associates (ESA) (Explanatory Document: ESA America's Cup Sustainability Plan Status Update Presentation to Committee) (Informational Report and Discussion)

Director Nutter reported that San Francisco has been selected as the site for the next America's Cup to be held during 2012 and 2013. The host agreement that was signed by the City last year mandated that the race emphasize resource sustainability and environmental stewardship. There are three parts of the America's Cup environmenta plan (1) the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process that is moving forward and focuses on mitigating impacts of the America's Cup race; (2) the event itself, which is a sustainability plan that includes visions, goals, and objectives; and (3) legacy around ocean education, which is still to be defined. The three main parties in the agreement, the Department of the Environment, the America's Cup Event Authority (ACEA) and America's Cup Organizing Committee (ACOC), have been working together along with many City agencies to develop a vision and plan for event sustainability.

Director Nutter introduced Mr. Kelly Runyon, ESA, the consultant who would be speaking on the sustainability planning and vision, Mr. Adam Van deWater, Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Mr. Peter Albert, Municipal Transportation Authority, and Ms. Jennifer Kass, lead Department of the Environment staff member on the America's Cup. She reported that ESA was brought in to (1) benchmark the plan against many other sustainability event plans that have been created all over the world for sporting events, and (2) to take an outline that was developed in the first few months in collaboration with City agencies, the Mayor's Office, and key stakeholders to sharpen the focus on issue areas.

Mr. Runyon reported that the America's Cup races will take place on the bay in the area between the Golden Gate Bridge and Bay Bridges and the San Francisco waterfront, and the area between those two places will provide a great deal of visibility of the races. Presentation topics discussed:

- Venues where spectator areas will be set up and where merchandise and entertainment will be available. (Slide 2)

- The America's Cup host city and venue agreement between the City, America's Cup Event Authority (ACEA) (which is overseeing the structure of the entire event), and the America's Cup Organizing Committee (ACOC), which is supporting the event. The agreement contains clear wording that this event will be emphasizing resource sustainability and environmental stewardship and defines several plans, e.g., the Sustainability Plan, the People Plan, and the Waste Management Plan. There are a number of other plans emerging and City plans, ordinances, and policies that bear on America's Cup activities. (Slide 3)

- Recent progress. Preparatory work was done in March and April with stakeholders and City departments resulting in a draft outline that lays out the issues that were recognized as key at that time. The authorship team includes the Department of the Environment, the ACEA, ACOC, and ESA with input from several City departments. The Plan is in the process of defining and developing the issue areas that are important to the plan, e.g., climate, transportation. (Slide 4)

- Relationship to CEQA. The CEQA Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) document is being prepared. The Sustainability Framework document will be available to the public after the issuance of the Draft EIR. The framework will allow for the adaptability of the final Sustainability Plan to others plans such as the People Plan. The Sustainability Plan is intended to be available some time after the conclusion of the DEIR comment period. (Slide 5)

- Sustainability Framework Sections, Principles for Plan Development, and Issue Areas. (Slides 6-14)

- Hierarchy of Concepts. The structure of the Plan is linked to a hierarchy of concepts that includes a sustainability vision statement and issue areas, principles and strategies surrounding the vision statement. (Slides 15-18)

- Next Steps. (Slide 19)

Commissioner Gravanis stated that there is a lot to be resolved about the relationship between the Draft EIR and the Sustainability Plan process. All relevant City ordinances and regulations would be clearly outlined, but are non-city regulations that might be relevant to making it a sustainable event, e.g., the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Regional Water Quality Control Board regulations, etc. become part of the consideration in this Plan? Mr. Runyon responded to the extent that the plans are

made known in the process. Commissioner Gravanis stated that there is a requirement that these plans be identified in the EIR process.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether recommendations for sustainability measure would be made on environmental concerns that are not included in existing rules anc regulations. She stated that a diagram had been presented of venues where spectator areas would be located and asked what would be done to keep people out of other areas. Mr. Runyon stated that these types of issues will either be added o could be incorporated by reference to the DEIR. In preparation of the DEIR, the Park Service has prepared drawings of proposed fencing to protect areas where there are sensitive species.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that in order to achieve a plastics-free goal, we would not want to allow people to sell single-serve water bottles. In order to do that in a fair way, we would need to provide water sources to spectator areas, e.g. jug fillers. Mr. Runyon reported that concept was in the initial outline. Director Nutter explained that the outline is an internal document of concepts that were provided to ESA.

Commissioner Wald discussed the relationship between the Sustainability Plan and the CEQA document. The CEQA document is supposed to analyze the event impacts and activities on the resources and built environment of San Francisco. If the provisions of the Sustainability Document are not addressed in the EIR, how can the EIF do a thorough job of predicting what the impacts are? If the Sustainability Plan is going to say no single-serve water bottles, but the EIR proposal does not say that there should be no single-serve water bottles, then we are not going to know what the impact of having a limitation on providing single-serve water bottles is. If you have a final CEQA document and there are provisions in the Sustainability Plan that are not included in it, how can one expect those provisions to be enforced or adopted?

Mr. Runyon responded that because the Sustainability Plan document is a plan, he doesn't expect it to make requirements of the event. It is expected that it would lay out goals for the event and strategies for reaching them. The Sustainability Plan stands apart from the information that is flowed into the EIR process and looks at issues separately and is not intended to rely on the Sustainability Plan at all. Commissioner Wald stated that is because it was set up that way. Mr. Runyon stated that the Sustainability Plan is not intended to impose requirements on the event. It is intended to set goals and describe strategies that could improve the event from a sustainability perspective. It may happen that the Sustainability Plan suggests some methods of improving the event that become mitigations, but we are not trying to take the Plan in that direction either. It sits apart from the CEQA process. Commissioner Wald asked what its utility is then. Mr. Runyon stated that it provides an organizing structure for these principles and provides a way to check the description of the project against sustainability goals. If it's important to incorporate something in the Sustainability Plan

into the project, then interested parties can point to that and say it's important. The Sustainability Plan is a source of comments.

Director Nutter stated we have been thinking of the Sustainability Plan as an umbrella document that pulls together all of the plans in the host agreement, e.g., the People Plan is specific to how the America's Cup will be handling the Transportation Element and vice-versa. We have been using the Sustainability Document as a way to bring together all of those plans and tie in the sustainability elements from them. We haven't necessarily been thinking about it as only a mitigation document. There are other elements that have been discussed that are part of a sustainability vision that are basically add-ons to making it an even greener event, even if they are not mitigating a negative impact. An example being, working with clean energy and clean tech companies in the Bay Area who may want to showcase their technologies to help reach sustainability goals, or to further carbon reductions on a particular activity, or setting up a new biofuel station that would be an additional resource. Reaching out to the clean-tech community and leveraging their resources to participate in the America's Cup Plan would not necessarily go in the EIR but could be laid out as what our vision would be to engage that community and leverage their resources as part of the sustainability vision.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether the People Plan would be in the EIR. Mr. Peter Albert, Municipal Transportation Authority, explained that the environmental review document is supposed to scope out whatever potential impacts there are and figure out ways to mitigate them or consider them. The Sustainability Plan is really your vision. Some pieces may be environmentally significant and maybe some aren't, but it helps do things that we may want to do. The Transportation Element is much easier to talk about because there are some things that we are really excited about with the People Plan that are not going to be potentially significant environmentally, but will make walking feel more comfortable, make bicycle connections more convenient, and bike parking secure. You don't use a plan to talk about mitigating impacts and you don't use an environmental document to do planning. The environmental document gives a wide range of things that we can do as a city to be sustainable in our transportation planning, to be creative, and to be convenient. Then we are safe knowing that whatever ideas we come up with are comfortably within what has been analyzed for environmental impacts. The Sustainability Plan helps point out connections. There is a Transportation Plan, a Waste Management Plan, and then there are other plans that all have relationships. This Sustainability Plan is as Director Nutter said, is an umbrella. There are things that will be focused on in the Transportation Plan such as having frequent and reliable buses or having light rail be up and running on time. There are other things that we would like to do such as encouraging the purchase of carbon offsets when people fly into San Francisco. That is not necessarily in the Transportation Plan, but is something the Sustainability Plan can address.

Commissioner Wald stated that purchasing carbon offsets applies to the environmental impact of this event. People are going to come here from all over the world. If the EIR is to do a good job, it will have to talk about the consequences of people coming from all over the world. You should look to address what can be done to address people coming from all over the world, rather than mitigate the consequences. Mr. Albert stated that environmental documents talk about what can be controlled. You can say, we have to shut this street down and make more room for bicycles, and then the City agencies will do it. Other than those suggestions, it would be difficult for us to say that no-one can come to an event unless they buy carbon offsets. Commissioner Wald stated but you could say it is a goal to have at least 10% of people who come here to purchase carbon offsets and if you achieve that goal, this would be the result. Mr. Albert stated that environmental review is limited because it reviews something called level of service, which for example is how many vehicles are moving through an intersection. That is why the Plan is so important because the environmental document by CEQA law is very narrow in what it analyzes. If we were worried about how many cars are moving through an intersection, we would never get to talk about carbon offsets or the quality of the pedestrian environment. They go hand in hand. One is doing what the law needs you to do; the other is really setting the aspirations and goals.

Commissioner Wald stated that she needs some sense of how the environmental document and plan will be related. For example, if you have a goal to reach zero waste, what is it that is going to happen to make that goal a part of that event? There should be a plan in place for doing that, a plan that this Department and maybe other departments can marshal the troops that care about these issues to use the environmental document in the review process as a way to get principles and strategies part of the plan so there are results. There is no answer right now, but it is on our radar screen that there are these different processes that need to be connected and collaborated on so ideas are not missed and we do reach the end goal of having a real plan that has impact. Director Nutter stated that there is no answer right now, but it is on our radar screen that there are these different processes that need to be connected and collaborated on so ideas are not missed and we do reach the end goal of having a real plan that has impact.

Commissioner Wald stated that for example, if it looks like they are not going to do zero waste, and the plan says and people waving the plan say, you have to change this so you can do zero waste. You have to be careful that people don't hear that and when the EIR comes out, we are going to water down the plan so it matches the EIR. You want to make the end result match what is in the plan and lift the event to the level of the Sustainability Plan rather than the other way around.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that she appreciates that there is a difference between the mitigations that can be required by CEQA. She stated that Mr. Albert provided one example of how CEQA is very limited. Another is that CEQA doesn't require analyzing impacts on habitat that isn't labeled "sensitive habitat," or it doesn't require analyzing impacts on species that haven't been identified as "sensitive species." One of the things that have been talked about by the ACOC is that we want to go beyond CEQA because just doing what CEQA requires and the mitigations that will come out of the CEQA process will not be adequate to reach the level of sustainability that we all want. It is okay if the Sustainability Plan will have things in it that go beyond what is going to be in the EIR and required by the EIR. The concern is that the Sustainability Plan is not intended to impose requirements on the event, which brings up the question about how much energy should be put into something if it is not going to result in actions and will be seen by departments involved as visionary or aspirational. Ways should be identified to put some teeth into the Sustainability Plan in addition to what is in the EIR mitigations.

Public Comment
Ms. Jan Blum, interested party, stated that she has been following the America's Cup event and is interested in seeing it be a sustainable event for all concerned. One of the things that many of us are trying to get our arms around are definitive timelines and organizational charts so we know who is making decisions about what. It is hard for the public. It is now June 13 and the Sustainability Plan is expected to come out in July, so there is little time for feedback or commentary. Ms. Blum stated that it would be helpful for the public to know specifically what's coming out when, when comments are due, then what happens next. If the ACEA does not agree with the suggested sustainability practices, will they be able to not honor them? Who makes the decision about what is and not included? The complex organization is a mystery, who decides what and when? How does the City relate to the ACEA, who has the power? What is the role of the event management in decision making in terms of sustainability and practices put in place? The major concern would be that we have no teeth in making the right things happen.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether people can comment on the Draft Sustainability Plan at the same time as the publication of the Draft EIR. Director Nutter stated that people would be able to comment on the framework. An email address would be provided where comments could be submitted on the framework.

Mr. Michael Davis, U.S. Pure Water, inquired whether the outline addresses what is his main interest, restricting bottled water sales. Director Nutter reported that it does include this idea. Mr. Davis inquired whether these ideas would only be suggestions that are going to be made in regards to how the America's Cup is going to proceed with the different issues. He reported that U.S. Pure Water just did a bottled-water free event for the Harmony Festival in Sonoma County in Santa Rosa in which nine water

filling stations were provided. The success of that event was based on restricting vendors from selling bottled water. If that were not to be done, there would have been tons of single water bottles everywhere, and there were almost none. People were hydrated better than they had been at this festival than in the past because there were nine stations available to fill up with water. The festival averaged 8000 people every day, which may be smaller than America's Cup. It was a successful event and was the first time it was done for the Harmony Festival. People were happy to get free water everywhere they went. This is part of reclaiming the commons of water, which is an important statement to make, as well as the environmental impact of restricting all of those single-use bottles that get into the landfill or get shipped to China on a container, get burned, and toxic fumes created and called recycling. How do we restrict vendors from selling bottled water? There are ways to create enough permanent and temporary stations to allow people to fill up their bottles at convenient spots so they would be better hydrated than if bottled water were to be sold. He suggested that comments be made on how this can be accomplished.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether water bottles were supplied as part of the event promotion. Mr. Davis stated that no, there were promotional bottles available to be purchased at the site, but it was encouraged in all of the promotional material handed out before the event that people bring their own reusable bottle or reusable container, and a lot of people did. Compostable cups were available for a donation of $1 per cup, and there was a big five-gallon bottle to put money in. Most of the donation money went to Women's Earth Alliance, which is a non-profit organization that helps bring potable water to countries like Africa and India. It was in line with reclaiming the commons. It is also a good educational piece because if you have those compostable cups for people to use and they continuously grab them and throw them away, if they are paying for them, it gives them an idea about the value. Even though they are compostable they do require a lot of fossil fuels to be used to make them, and they don't break down well in a normal compost pile.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether there is a list of souvenirs that would be sold as part of the event or if anybody could sell what they want. Commissioner Gravanis inquired who would be contracting with the vendors.

Ms. Kyri McClellan, ACOC, reported that the America's Cup intellectual property, the rights that go with it, the t-shirts, the hats, trinkets etc. are a highly marketable and prized commodity, and the ACEA has the rights to the intellectual property. When you win the cup, you win the rights that go with it. Oracle Racing, that is sailing for the Golden Gate Yacht Club has created the ACEA, and they have the rights to create whatever merchandise they would like to sell. They are a relatively new organization as the ACOC is and are starting to put those pieces in place. The ACOC is endeavoring to introduce them to folks such as a local organic t-shirt manufacturer in San Francisco that might be able to help them produce their t-shirts so the product is

not only local but also a great product. ACOC's role is to help foster those relationships and make lots of introductions, but ultimately ACEC decides who their partners, are all with an eye towards creating revenue. Last year,

Ms. McClellan reported that last year, the City made a decision to not put General Fund resources into the event and to ultimately work with the ACOC and support the ACEA in finding corporate sponsors. It was reported that the General Fund does not have the ability to put money towards this event, so with that shifting, there is a little bit less control over some of these aspects. The ACOC is working on not only raising the funds that will be necessary, but also providing additional resources along with the Department of the Environment. That's why we have EAF, the Planning Conservation League, Save the Bay, 11th Hour Racing, and Sailors for the Sea. Part of the ACOC's work is to help resource venues (e.g. show-casing solar) and helping create the right partners so it can be an expo for great technology and environmental innovations. Work is being accomplished to fulfill the ACOC's obligations to support the exceptional work that the Department of the Environment has done to kick-start this effort. ACOC is working on a constrained timeframe and would not choose to do it this way, but commitments have to be met, and it is necessary to get to the point of making a decision whether it is viable.

Ms. McClellan explained that there are decisions that have to be made at the end of the CEQA process for the City and the ACEA. If there are mitigation requirements in the environmental review document that no longer makes this feasible or possible from a timeframe perspective, the ACEA and the City has the ability to say this isn't going to work. Work is being done to get to that decision point as quickly as possible in order to move forward with the implementation phase. At the same time, there are plans to bring folks together and have conversations about what we want this event to be in approximately 25 months from now. She appreciates the Commissioners comments and will bring them back to the ACEA.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired about the sale of souvenirs that the ACEA would be controlling and requirements for vendor permits. Who would vendors have to apply for permits from for example, to sell hot dogs in a booth on the Embarcadero?

Ms. McClellan stated that the Port would be the best entity to answer these questions since leases for this event would be issued by the Port for use of the piers. The City agreement states that leases would have to be approved by the Port and then the Board of Supervisors. The City is also negotiating a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the National Parks Trust for the use of their properties and would need a use permit that would be subject to CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Port would have to approve a permit to sell hotdogs along the Embarcadero. The ACEA is in the process of negotiating a lease with the Port for terms of use and what is called for in the City agreement. First CEQA has to be completed

and then leases negotiated for short-term use in addition to what happens in the future with long-term development rights just for the use of the property.

Commissioner Gravanis asked whether the Port could add to a food vendor concessionaire permit a prohibition on selling plastic water bottles. She explained tha there is no ban on plastic water bottles, but in order to make America's Cup a sustainable event, there may be an agreement that issuing this prohibition is essential. What mechanism is available to make sure that this prohibition is added to permits?

Ms. McClellan stated that Port leases will be executed with the Event Authority. She explained that Mr. Adam Van deWater of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development is working with the Port on negotiation and execution of those leases. Commissioner Gravanis stated that she hopes that the Sustainability Plan would be the tool needed to make the Board do the right thing but is unsure if the Plan will have the power to do so and if the timing is right. Ms. McClellan stated that lease negotiations are in process now but won't be executed until after CEQA, so decisions can't be made until then. The timing is very close and parallel. In order for the event to be successful, CEQA needs to be finished before venue leases are put in place and construction will start.

Mr. Van deWater stated that the America's Cup was won by the Golden Gate Yacht Club, but technically America's Cup is not an official City project until it is cleared by CEQA. Once it is a project, permits will have to be filed with various agencies such as the Recreation and Park Department for the use of Marina Green and with the Port fo the use of their piers. It may be necessary to go through the Intergovernmental Select Committee on Traffic and Transportation for control of the space around the piers. The merchandise and their real value are the trademarks, which is the event itself and selling the television rights to do that event. Then it is the merchandising, the sale of food and beverage that goes along with the estimated number of spectators. The City would love to see those vendors who sell food, beverages and logos where they are permitted on the Marina Green serve some of these spectators. They will have to be outside of that perimeter and not be on permitted land that the ACEA is using, but they could be still serving the public coming to the northeast of the City. This would require a separate Department of Public Works permit. That would be part of the economic impact and value of the City hosting the event where both parties have benefits.

Mr. Van deWater stated that persons coming to watch the event will be staying in San Francisco hotels and restaurants, which is where the City gets its value long-term. This will help improve the General Fund and is the economic benefit that a lot of people have been talking about. Commissioner Wald stated as well as the jobs that will be created.

Public Comment

Mr. David Pilpel (1) asked that ESA's PowerPoint presentation be provided to the Commission Secretary for the record; (2) stated that the EIR has to be approved by the Planning Commission, and there will be other bodies that review the EIR, but who has approval authority over the Sustainability Plan? and (3) since the Commission on the Environment sets policy for the Department, the Commission could decide that it is the policy of the Commission to approve or not approve the Sustainability Plan unless it does the following. He encouraged the Commission to engage in this exercise in its power as a Commission.

Director Nutter stated that she believes there is something in the host agreement that is titled the LEED plan, which is the Sustainability Plan. Director Nutter stated that the host agreement includes a LEED plan, which is essentially the same as the Sustainability Plan. It is the ACEA that has the responsibility for executing the Plan. She inquired with Mr. Van deWater if there is a process for approval of the plan. Mr. Van deWater stated that the host event agreement calls for nine different plans, e.g., the People Plan, LEED Plan, Waste Management and Zero Waste Plan, Security Plan, Advertising Plan, Marketing Plan, and there are two additional plans that have been recognized that are important to this conversation (1) the Public Access Management or Parks Plan relationship with the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) and National Park Service (NPS) for managing spectator volume; and (2) the Sustainability Plan, which is not specifically called for in the host venue agreement but was recognized early on to oversee the entire plan. Per the host venue agreement, there would be a LEED Plan, Waste Management Plan, and People Plan all of which have sustainability elements to them, but we would not have a Sustainability Plan. In order to live up to the commitment to be a zero waste sustainable event, a Sustainability Plan is being created that will address issues such as what is carbon neutral and how far do we cast that net, what do we mean in terms of waste diversion or reduction, what are we doing for the use of power both at the spectator areas and water, and how are we unifying all of this into one plan. In conversations with the Department of the Environment, the Event Authority, the Office of Economic Workforce Development, and others, it was decided that the Sustainability Plan will create that framework to help Ms. McClellan go to the marketplace to help fundraise for the City from a sustainability perspective and to help demonstrate that commitment to holding a sustainable event. The Sustainability Plan will be developed between the Department of the Environment and the Event Authority as part of this working group under the schedule that Ms. McClellan raised by which we have the white paper of what is required by local, state, and federal law and what we would like to see, such as refillable water stations, which is on the list. ESA was brought in as a technical consultant to make specific recommendations and fine tune suggestions.

Mr. Van deWater reported that a detailed Sustainability Plan outline will be published in the next couple of weeks, and then a Draft EIR issued in late June early July. There will be a timeframe for the comments and response period. There won't be the educational benefit of the comments and response period for the outline, but EIR comments can be included in the Sustainability Plan going forward.

Director Nutter stated that because what we are envisioning will be included in the Sustainability Plan on the building requirements specifically, it is possible that we coulc fulfill our commitments to the LEED plan by doing the Sustainability Plan. Commissione Wald asked who would approve the Sustainability Plan. Is it the negotiation between the ACEA, Department of the Environment, and the ACOC? Who is the decider on the EIR? Mr. Van deWater responded the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Wald inquired whether the ACEA and ACOC will be influential voices in the decisions. Mr. Van deWater stated that he believes it will be jointly approved by the ACEA and the City through the Department of the Environment. Commissioner Wald asked whether it would be approved in a public venue. Mr. Van deWater stated that a series of public meetings will be held to solicit feedback on the Sustainability Plan.

Mr. Van deWater stated that the host venue agreement for the preliminary draft of th People Plan required it to be issued on March 31st. This was one of the first five plans tc be issued. Subsequently, a progress report was issued based on the 35 public stakeholder meetings held in that intervening time and on comments received by email, in-person and in other meetings. Mr. Peter Albert is spearheading this effort anc talking with regional transportation providers on impacts. Mr. Albert is working with the MTA on cost estimates and further refining those details. Three progress reports will be issued based on that preliminary draft over the next several months. The host venue agreement requires that the People Plan be delivered to the ACEA by December 30. The goal is to have three progress reports and the preliminary draft of the People Plan in the public realm with comments, responses, and actions to take, cost estimates, implementation strategies and deliver the Plan in early September for approval by September 30. A similar strategy is being thought about for the Sustainability Plan, where you have the EIR process, invite feedback on the plan, and continue to refine i from there.

Commissioner Wald suggested that the Commission on the Environment approve the Sustainability Plan since it is within its purview and expertise in order to give it a green seal of approval at a public hearing. Mr. Van deWater stated that would be up to Director Nutter. He reported that the ACEA is looking to host an athletic event within their expertise, which is sailing. They want to hold this event in San Francisco. The City has to permit that use so they have to go through a series of conditions largely codified in the event and host venue agreement. In addition, they have to apply for various permits and leases. The ACEA will meet the letter of local, state, and federal

laws and all of its requirements. The ACEA also wants this to be a green event and it is in their best interest in terms of marketing, sponsorship and everything else to have a green event, and they are committed to that. Having a green event sometimes comes with a cost so they are not going to do everything they are asked to do. The City perspective is to identify how to have a successful event that will fulfill the City's cultural interests and provide economic benefits in a sustainable manner.

Public Comment

Ms. Lorraine Palmer, Sea Scavenger Conservancy, reported that Sea Scavenger Conservancy is a non-profit project that focuses on the cleanup of ocean plastics. She asked if it is possible to indicate within these individual plans which line items or concepts in those plans are governed by the EIR and which ones are more aspirational. This would be a way to focus on items that may not be required in the mitigation, but may be important to advocate for. At what point do we know that the Sustainability Plan is not a part of the host agreement yet? Will the Sustainability Plan be adopted as part of a contractual item?

Mr. Adam Van deWater reported that the host venue agreement has been the guiding document ever since it was signed and has been agreed to by all of the three parties in this agreement, the City, ACOC, and ACEA. That is not to say that it can't evolve. We are here to say that the very concept of sustainability shows its evolution. Going back to amend it could take one or two actions. Increases to the financial obligations of the City would have to go through the Board of Supervisors since they adopted it as the City's level of commitment. If the activity defines it in a way that does not increase the City's financial exposure, it could be those three signatory parties that could make those amendments. The premise that has been operated under so far is that the Sustainability Plan clarifies commitments already made in the host and venue agreement, the LEED Plan, the Waste Management Plan, and the general commitments to make this a sustainable zero waste event. This Plan is our visionary framework and document for realizing those commitments. If we reach a point where we are proposing things that are reasonable and are conditions for the event to happen in San Francisco, and the ACEA indicates it won't do anything more than the basic letter of the law, a contractual amendment could be thought about. Right now we are operating under the shared purpose that we are creating something that is in their best interests and that of the City and we are working collaboratively to come up with solutions that will allow us to make this a green and sustainable event without making it cost prohibitive to them.

Mr. Van deWater stated that Director Nutter has had innovative ideas toward this end that would be low cost to the ACEA and would be high value to the City and the environment. Commissioner Wald stated that it is not presumed that you would change your relationship to the various bodies. Is it true that the additional

commitments would be put in writing? For example, if the parties decide they are going to have fuel cells on Marina Green, aren't they going to put that in writing so no-one that goes to the event finds old engines being used. Mr. Van deWater stated that we need to connect the vision to the implementation. Previous tenants of Marina Green have requested a greener technology for their events. In years past, the company that sets up special events for the Opera or a corporate function has not known of a vendor that will supply the power requirements without using diesel generators. Maybe that has changed and we can ask one of these tech companies to emphasize their product at the event. What we don't want to do is say to the ACEA that you have to have green power on the Marina Green as a condition for hosting the event when there is no supplier available.

Commissioner Wald stated that if everybody agrees that there is a vendor and if everybody agrees that using that vendor is a good thing, it could be part of the contract between the parties. Director Nutter stated it could be part of some agreement. Commissioner Wald stated that if you show up during the event and if they are not using the vendor that everyone said should be used you could point to the document that says the vendor that wouldn't use diesel generators was supposed to be used. She stated she does not know when and how this will happen or in what document.

Ms. Palmer stated there is a law that requires zero discharge of marine debris. She hasn't seen that requirement in any plans yet or does not know if it is being addressed. She stated that when she looks at these plans, she wants to know what is being required by the EIR, where it is being addressed, and if it's optional, why. She wants to know what is governing it. Commissioner Wald stated that it sounds like it will be in the EIR because it part of a law, policy, or regulation. Commissioner Wald stated that EIR will be useful for allowing us to walk between what is required and what isn't. Ms. Palmer stated it will clearly distinguish what is required and aspirational.

Public Comment

Mr. Stephen Kreftig, former Environment Commissioner, representing the Presidio Environmental Council, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters, and participant in the Council of Environmental Organizations working on the America's Cup. He stated that he sometimes wishes that San Francisco was more like New York in that while our city limits go past Treasure Island, go up to Red Rock, and take in a slither of Angel Island, we don't control Sausalito, Oakland, or Alameda. How do we know that financial remediation will be provided to the National Park Service and Golden Gate National Recreation Area for significant impacts on their land? Are they going to be making any money off of the sites that will be used for the event? There are legal limits to the jurisdiction of the Commission on the Environment, but we need to keep in mind throughout all of these discussions, ways to fund what is necessary all around the bay

in terms of protecting the environment. You don't want vendors in Sausalito to hand out plastic bags to shoppers or plastic bottles to float in the bay. You have to identify a way to make agreements with other entities to share common rules about how these things are done and to see if the transportation agencies will talk to each other and coordinate in a good fashion. There is great potential in the use of Golden Gate Transit that has been untapped for many years and in legacy improvements to transportation, in particular to the Presidio. The money needs to go to other communities as well.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether the City is coordinating with other entities. Director Nutter stated that our Department is not doing so yet. A discussion has been held about having a network of sustainability directors in the Bay Area who meet on a regular basis and using that platform to talk about what activities in San Francisco can be exported to other cities. We don't have control over other jurisdictions, but we can share best practices and thinking around sustainability, which we plan to do.

Mr. Albert stated that one of the legacies we hope to leave with the America's Cup is the way the region and San Francisco work together. The second regional transportation provider's meeting that focuses on how well we are all cooperating with the America's Cup will be held tomorrow. He reported that the Executive Director of the Municipal Transportation Commission pointed out that America's Cup is a Bay Area event, not a San Francisco event and makes a great impact on transportation. What is interesting is how much support we are getting from the regional transportation providers, not just BART, CalTrain, Golden Gate Transit, but also CalTrans and the Municipal Transportation Commission. Some ideas you will be seeing shortly is the Clipper Card being extended universally so it is an unlimited or extended Clipper Card and is invisible whether you are on a bus, ferry, or BART. Work is in progress to extend that to bike sharing. There is interest in innovative ideas that are happening in the region. Golden Gate Transit is limited in the way it can serve San Francisco. It can pick up people in Marin and drop them off in San Francisco, but can't pick up people in San Francisco and drop them off in San Francisco. Because this is an extraordinary event, we are getting agreements and support for pioneering Golden Gate Transit as another transit vehicle on the street and to allow for the use of the Clipper Card to help people move from one part of Van Ness Avenue to another. If this were a permanent transportation plan there might be more anxiety, but because people recognize how extraordinary this event is and if this idea did not work out, we could say we gave it a good try and would give us more comfort and flexibility in pioneering these agreements between the region and the City. We will be seeing a lot of these ideas come in from the public.

Mr. Albert stated that at the end of June, there will be a second progress report where it is hoped to make clear what agreements were worked out with the regional transportation providers. It is hoped that will be a good example for the Sustainability

Plan. The agreements that have been worked out between the City and the region through the People Plan will be a mini legacy for the long term legacy of all plans working together.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired that if the Department of the Environment and the ACEA agree that the Sustainability Plan will call for no releases of helium balloons for example, are the people in Marin County going to feel like they need to pay attentior to that agreement? She stated that she would like to see early negotiations and discussions and communication to make sure that nobody in Marin County or Oakland are going to say, who does the Department of the Environment think they are, to be the one city involved in the Sustainability Plan and then tell us what to do.

Mr. Van deWater stated that Mr. Albert has been coordinating the People Plan with a the transportation providers and other cities. Similar efforts have been done with the Security Plan to engage the region in terms of their local police and sheriff's departments, the marine units, Highway Patrol, FBI, Secret Service, etc. Similarly a general cast was done for involvement of all local governments. There has been outreach to city managers and planning commissioners from the north, east and soutl bays. This has not been accomplished yet with the Sustainability Plan but has been or other plans developed, e.g. the People and Security Plans. Since this event is in San Francisco Bay, it will have regional impacts.

Public Comment

Ms. Lurilla Harris inquired about the entity responsible for handling the security. Mr. Var deWater reported that the Deputy Chief of Operations will be coordinating with various law enforcement agencies throughout the region, country and state. It will be a large effort for the local police, the regional highway patrol, and possibly will require federal involvement.

Ms. Jan Blum inquired whether there would be coordination with the Park Service. Mr Van deWater concurred. There would be shared manpower between the park police, California, state and federal agencies. Discussions have been held about having volunteer traffic control, so the law enforcement can do law enforcement and not just pointing people in the right direction. The Chief of Operations has been holding regular briefings and working on getting all hands on deck in order to have a coordinated effort.

Mr. Pilpel suggested that the next time America's Cup is brought back to the Commission, that the Plan should be tied in better with specific smaller actions, not the EIR approval and mitigations, but the DPW and Recreation and Park Department permits. That is where the details will come out.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether the Draft Sustainability Plan will be available by the next Policy Committee meeting on July 11. Director Nutter reported that a framework document should be available soon. Commissioner Wald inquired whether public hearings would be held. Director Nutter stated that a discussion should be held on the process between the three parties. The discussion of the Sustainability Planning framework was continued to the July 11 Policy Committee meeting.

5. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Continued from the May 9, 2011 Meeting) Sponsor: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Monica Fish, Commission Secretary (Explanatory Document: Memo to Policy Committee and Commission Outreach Draft List) (Informational Report and Discussion)

This agenda item was continued to the July 11, 2011 Meeting.

6. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

Director Nutter reported that she had attended a C40 Climate Summit in Sao Paulo Brazil last week. There were fifty-seven cities from around the world talking about sustainability efforts in their cities. She presented on the City's Zero Waste and received a phenomenal response from people congratulating San Francisco on their great work and how we are leading the way internationally. Ms. Partin was also in attendance presenting on Green Taxis. Announcements were made that (1) the World Bank would be participating in and supporting cities in their sustainability plans; and (2) ICLEI would be coming out with a tool for all cities to track their carbon.

Director Nutter announced that an Ordinance was filed to repeal the 1932 Ordinance that governs our current waste system. In the name of competitive billing, it would split up Recology's current control over the system, which has helped us get to our 77% diversion rate. The City Attorney is reviewing the Ordinance, and information is being prepared about what the effect will be on our zero waste system.

Director Nutter introduced Department of Public Works Director Ed Reiskin to discuss an issue that Commissioners have expressed an interest in about a proposal related to management of street trees. Ms. Hui, Urban Forestry Council Coordinator, is in attendance to speak on this issue.

Public Comment

Mr. Reiskin, Director, Department of the Public Works (DPW) stated that DPW is responsible under the Urban Forestry Ordinance, which is part of the Public Works Code, for management and stewardship of the City's urban forest. Staff are dedicated and committed to this effort and understand the importance of a very

healthy and strong urban forest. The way the urban forest is managed right now from a maintenance perspective is that there are about 90,000 street trees in San Francisco, about 2/3 of which are the maintenance responsibility of private property owners. The other 1/3 are maintained by the government. There are reasons for why the majority is maintained by private property owners and others by the government, but it does not explain the situation. DPW right now has 11 arborists maintaining approximately 30,000 trees. With the current staffing, there is ability to trim trees on an average of every 10 – 12 years. The industry standard for maintaining trees would require maintenance every three to five years. There is less than half the capacity to adequately maintain those 30,000 trees. He discussed budget cuts that DPW has had to face in every aspect of its operation. There are now only 11 people to maintain those 30,000 trees which is not adequate or responsible. The fact that most are maintained by private property owners is also not an equitable provision of government service.

Mr. Reiskin stated that he is proposing under his authority under the Public Works Code to relinquish responsibility of those trees to private property owners. The Urban Forestry Ordinance lays out a procedure by which that can happen which includes the government making sure that the trees are in good condition before they are relinquished. There are noticing requirements, opportunities for a public hearing for each and any individual who requests one to review the decision of the government to relinquish. Because of the requirement to get the trees in good condition before relinquishment, it is projected that it would take DPW seven years to relinquish on the order of 24,000 street trees, which may be an ambitious target. It is proposed that the process is started to return the 1/3 or a portion of the 1/3 of trees back to the private property owners so they would be maintaining trees just as the other two thirds of those that have street trees in front of their houses.

The Mayor's proposed budget in this fiscal year requires an additional DPW budget reduction for street trees. The 11 arborist will be reduced to 7 that are responsible for maintaining these 30,000 trees, but even without a budget cut, the trees cannot be maintained adequately. There are concerns about how well private property owners maintain their trees and is a matter of debate. DPW maintains that it maintains trees better even in its diminished capacity than private property owners. Currently, 2/3s are being maintained by private property owners, so a radical shift is not being made. A better long-term strategy is being seen for the City to have the funds to maintain the entire urban forest and all of the 90,000 street trees. There are ways that other cities have approached this through a landscape assessment district. The City of Oakland has one for part of their urban forest, and other cities have them. To have a dedicated funding source to properly, consistently and professionally maintain all of the street trees would be DPW's recommendation and preference in the long-term. Until that happens, DPW is trying to bring the amount of street tree assets more in line with the resources available to maintain them. Mr. Reiskin stated that he requested the

hearing on this topic at the City Operations and Neighborhood Services earlier today and the issue will probably be discussed at DPW's budget hearing next Monday.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether any of these trees that would be relinquished are ones that were planted under the FACE or the RAP program in the 1960's and 70's. Mr. Reiskin reported he does not know the details of those programs, but a lot of the trees are in current or former redevelopment areas, which is one of the reasons they came into the City's responsibility. Commissioner Gravanis stated that many of these trees were planted without the permission of the property owner, which is a different situation than the trees that were planted through Friends of the Urban Forest or other programs where the property is involved in the decision. She asked how to deal with the surprise by private property owners. How does the fine for chopping down a tree without a permit compare to the annual cost of maintaining a street tree? It may be that a lot of people would remove a tree in order to avoid the cost of maintenance or the liability of someone tripping over the sidewalk if the tree caused a lot of root damage. Mr. Reiskin stated that he believes the fine for illegal removal starts at $1400. Annual maintenance costs vary quite a bit. DPW has been encouraging in recent years planting lower-maintenance trees particularly in terms of how they break up the sidewalk. Generally, the costs are not onerous. It will be more difficult for those of lower income than for others. Right now property owners are responsible for maintenance of sidewalks. This issue was raised by the City a couple of years ago at which point the City was saying that if you don't want to maintain the tree, come and get a removal permit. That is certainly not a policy that DPW is supportive of or that is consistent with a number of City plans, e.g., the Better Streets Plan. Generally, the removal of a healthy tree would not be permitted.

Commissioner Gravanis asked if DPW would be dealing with all of the paperwork, such as 3R reports in terms of people purchasing a home with a tree in front of it, to make sure that they will know that they will be assuming maintenance responsibility of that tree. Mr. Reiskin stated that right now everybody is responsible for their sidewalk and most people are responsible if there is a tree in front of it. He is unsure how that flows through the real estate process. Commissioner Gravanis stated you would not want to take the risk of surprising people. She stated that the Policy Committee had a discussion about work stalling on the Urban Forest Plan and the idea that if we don't have money to do the whole plan and focus on street tree maintenance, to give consideration to a landscape assessment district by which private property owners would be able to pay into a fund that would result in a lot less cost per tree because of the economy of scale, and the ability of a professional landscape company that would be able to do a whole block at once. It was hoped that would be picked up by the Urban Forestry Council or DPW. Isn't it conceivable to put that in the books within the seven years to focus attention on first? Mr. Reiskin stated that these discussions have been held and research held on steps that would be required, and even laying out a timeline. Support would be needed from elected officials and the

Board because it will require their approval. He spoke in support of this program but stated that it would take time to accomplish. There has not been that much interest in making this happen because of the current economy. If the economy were to rebound, it might be a good time to advance it.

Commissioner Wald stated that it would make more sense to consider this type of program before trees are relinquished so you wouldn't have to take them back at a future time. Consider which trees might be more appropriate to give up, such as ones that are unsuitable for the places they are located, and then have a conversation with a landowner about a more targeted program that would be consistent with the kind of program you would like to have and goals for those programs. Where is the impetus for the landscape assessment district going to come once you announce that trees will be relinquished? Mr. Reiskin stated that people think that if the government is maintaining my tree now for free, they would certainly be less inclined to support an assessment district. As trees will be relinquished, there will be more people who would stand to benefit. He is unsure how trees can be relinquished strategically so that it works better in the future. DPW would have to get the trees in good shape to relinquish. Even for the trees that are not well suited to the environment, there is reluctance to encourage people to cut them down if they are healthy. Unless the tree is causing a safety hazard, causing significant property damage or has space constraints that can't be addressed, an application to remove a tree that is otherwise healthy will be rejected.

Ms. Mei Ling Hui, Urban Forestry Council Coordinator distributed DPW Tree Plan Fact Sheets. She discussed the concerns expressed at the Board of Supervisors Committee meeting today on the plan. Most of the public spoke against the plan and noted costs, tree size, sidewalk and tree maintenance concerns. Commissioner Wald asked in the case when the property owner is not responsible for the tree, would they not be responsible for the sidewalk? Mr. Reiskin stated that a private property owner is not responsible for damage to the sidewalk caused by the tree if it's a city-maintained tree. If a sidewalk is cracked and it is not related to the tree, then it is the property owner's responsibility. If a tree is breaking up or lifting a sidewalk, that is the City's responsibility if it is a City-maintained tree.

7. **Announcements.** (Discussion) This agenda topic was not discussed at this time.

8. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion) Future agenda items discussed for the July 11 meeting included (1) review of the Outreach List; (2) Sustainability Framework for the America's Cup; and (3) Balloon Ordinance update. Agenda item requests discussed for the August meeting included (1) factual data on the Bag Ordinance, (2) Commission on the Environment Retreat follow-up; and (3) Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan. Director Nutter stated that there is a case pending at the state level that is supposed to be resolved in September that may

direct the timing on the bag issue. This case would dictate how much money a City would have to invest in CEQA review of a bag ban or additions to a bag ordinance. Commissioner Gravanis reported that the Bird-safe Building Guidelines would be coming to the Planning Commission soon and pointed out that the Commission was not able to weigh in on it because the Commission was advised that it was not allowed to talk about window treatments for saving birds. It was suggested that one or two Policy Committee meetings be devoted to Charter provision interpretations.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel stated that he attended a briefing of SFMade which is an organization that promotes local manufacturing. He suggested that this type of discussion be incorporated into the Sustainability Plan and all activities within the Department. He suggested a discussion on the Commission's policy goals, which was on the Retreat agenda but not discussed.

9. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

10. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,
Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, July 11, 2011at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee with each set of minutes, or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org.

Approved:

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

AUG 0 8 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

3.71
6/13/11
approved

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:02 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Excused: Commissioner Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the May 9, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: May 9, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the May 9, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection. (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash).

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. Ms. Maria D'Agostino discussed her concerns expressed today at the Board of Supervisors City Operations and Neighborhood Services Committee meeting on the Department of Public Work's (DPW) Sidewalk Tree Maintenance Relinquishment Plan to adjacent property owners. She stated that she spoke at that meeting as a concerned citizen and not in her capacity as Chair of the Urban Forestry Council. Ms. D'Agostino discussed her background as a certified arborist, certified municipal specialist, certified

tree risk assessor, former volunteer and employee for Friends of the Urban Forest, former employee of the City and County of San Francisco Bureau of Urban Forestry, and urban forester for the City of Redwood City. Ms. D'Agostino provided examples of poor maintenance performed by private property owners and expressed her concerns with this Plan and the health and safety of our urban forest as it relates to planting, establishing, maintaining, and enhancing our urban forest canopy. Relinquishing without a proper education program and without any idea of private property owners resources to take on these responsibilities is not a good idea. The Urban Forestry Council's Planning and Funding Committee will be discussing this topic at its June 16 meeting at 4:15 p.m. City Hall, Room 421.

4. **America's Cup Event Sustainability Planning Update** Sponsor: Melanie Nutter, Director; Speaker: Kelly Runyon, Senior Engineer, Environmental Science Associates (ESA) (Explanatory Document: ESA America's Cup Sustainability Plan Status Update Presentation to Committee) (Informational Report and Discussion)

Director Nutter reported that San Francisco has been selected as the site for the next America's Cup to be held during 2012 and 2013. The host agreement that was signed by the City last year mandated that the race emphasize resource sustainability and environmental stewardship. There are three parts of the America's Cup environmental plan (1) the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process that is moving forward and focuses on mitigating impacts of the America's Cup race; (2) the event itself, which is a sustainability plan that includes visions, goals, and objectives; and (3) legacy around ocean education, which is still to be defined. The three main parties in the agreement, the Department of the Environment, the America's Cup Event Authority (ACEA) and America's Cup Organizing Committee (ACOC), have been working together along with many City agencies to develop a vision and plan for event sustainability.

Director Nutter introduced Mr. Kelly Runyon, ESA, the consultant who would be speaking on the sustainability planning and vision, Mr. Adam Van deWater, Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Mr. Peter Albert, Municipal Transportation Authority, and Ms. Jennifer Kass, lead Department of the Environment staff member on the America's Cup. She reported that ESA was brought in to (1) benchmark the plan against many other sustainability event plans that have been created all over the world for sporting events, and (2) to take an outline that was developed in the first few months in collaboration with City agencies, the Mayor's Office, and key stakeholders to sharpen the focus on issue areas.

Mr. Runyon reported that the America's Cup races will take place on the bay in the area between the Golden Gate Bridge and Bay Bridges and the San Francisco waterfront, and the area between those two places will provide a great deal of visibility of the races. Presentation topics discussed:

- Venues where spectator areas will be set up and where merchandise and entertainment will be available. (Slide 2)

- The America's Cup host city and venue agreement between the City, America's Cup Event Authority (ACEA) (which is overseeing the structure of the entire event), and the America's Cup Organizing Committee (ACOC), which is supporting the event. The agreement contains clear wording that this event will be emphasizing resource sustainability and environmental stewardship and defines several plans, e.g., the Sustainability Plan, the People Plan, and the Waste Management Plan. There are a number of other plans emerging and City plans, ordinances, and policies that bear on America's Cup activities. (Slide 3)

- Recent progress. Preparatory work was done in March and April with stakeholders and City departments resulting in a draft outline that lays out the issues that were recognized as key at that time. The authorship team includes the Department of the Environment, the ACEA, ACOC, and ESA with input from several City departments. The Plan is in the process of defining and developing the issue areas that are important to the plan, e.g., climate, transportation. (Slide 4)

- Relationship to CEQA. The CEQA Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) document is being prepared. The Sustainability Framework document will be available to the public after the issuance of the Draft EIR. The framework will allow for the adaptability of the final Sustainability Plan to others plans such as the People Plan. The Sustainability Plan is intended to be available some time after the conclusion of the DEIR comment period. (Slide 5)

- Sustainability Framework Sections, Principles for Plan Development, and Issue Areas. (Slides 6-14)

- Hierarchy of Concepts. The structure of the Plan is linked to a hierarchy of concepts that includes a sustainability vision statement and issue areas, principles and strategies surrounding the vision statement. (Slides 15-18)

- Next Steps. (Slide 19)

Commissioner Gravanis stated that there is a lot to be resolved about the relationship between the Draft EIR and the Sustainability Plan process. All relevant City ordinances and regulations would be clearly outlined, but are non-city regulations that might be relevant to making it a sustainable event, e.g., the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Regional Water Quality Control Board regulations, etc. become part of the consideration in this Plan? Mr. Runyon responded to the extent that the plans are

made known in the process. Commissioner Gravanis stated that there is a requirement that these plans be identified in the EIR process.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether recommendations for sustainability measures would be made on environmental concerns that are not included in existing rules and regulations. She stated that a diagram had been presented of venues where spectator areas would be located and asked what would be done to keep people out of other areas. Mr. Runyon stated that these types of issues will either be added or could be incorporated by reference to the DEIR. In preparation of the DEIR, the Park Service has prepared drawings of proposed fencing to protect areas where there are sensitive species.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that in order to achieve a plastics-free goal, we would not want to allow people to sell single-serve water bottles. In order to do that in a fair way, we would need to provide water sources to spectator areas, e.g. jug fillers. Mr. Runyon reported that concept was in the initial outline. Director Nutter explained that the outline is an internal document of concepts that were provided to ESA.

Commissioner Wald discussed the relationship between the Sustainability Plan and the CEQA document. The CEQA document is supposed to analyze the event impacts and activities on the resources and built environment of San Francisco. If the provisions of the Sustainability Document are not addressed in the EIR, how can the EIR do a thorough job of predicting what the impacts are? If the Sustainability Plan is going to say no single-serve water bottles, but the EIR proposal does not say that there should be no single-serve water bottles, then we are not going to know what the impact of having a limitation on providing single-serve water bottles is. If you have a final CEQA document and there are provisions in the Sustainability Plan that are not included in it, how can one expect those provisions to be enforced or adopted?

Mr. Runyon responded that because the Sustainability Plan document is a plan, he doesn't expect it to make requirements of the event. It is expected that it would lay out goals for the event and strategies for reaching them. The Sustainability Plan stands apart from the information that is flowed into the EIR process and looks at issues separately and is not intended to rely on the Sustainability Plan at all. Commissioner Wald stated that is because it was set up that way. Mr. Runyon stated that the Sustainability Plan is not intended to impose requirements on the event. It is intended to set goals and describe strategies that could improve the event from a sustainability perspective. It may happen that the Sustainability Plan suggests some methods of improving the event that become mitigations, but we are not trying to take the Plan in that direction either. It sits apart from the CEQA process. Commissioner Wald asked what its utility is then. Mr. Runyon stated that it provides an organizing structure for these principles and provides a way to check the description of the project against sustainability goals. If it's important to incorporate something in the Sustainability Plan

into the project, then interested parties can point to that and say it's important. The Sustainability Plan is a source of comments.

Director Nutter stated we have been thinking of the Sustainability Plan as an umbrella document that pulls together all of the plans in the host agreement, e.g., the People Plan is specific to how the America's Cup will be handling the Transportation Element and vice-versa. We have been using the Sustainability Document as a way to bring together all of those plans and tie in the sustainability elements from them. We haven't necessarily been thinking about it as only a mitigation document. There are other elements that have been discussed that are part of a sustainability vision that are basically add-ons to making it an even greener event, even if they are not mitigating a negative impact. An example being, working with clean energy and clean tech companies in the Bay Area who may want to showcase their technologies to help reach sustainability goals, or to further carbon reductions on a particular activity, or setting up a new biofuel station that would be an additional resource. Reaching out to the clean-tech community and leveraging their resources to participate in the America's Cup Plan would not necessarily go in the EIR but could be laid out as what our vision would be to engage that community and leverage their resources as part of the sustainability vision.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether the People Plan would be in the EIR. Mr. Peter Albert, Municipal Transportation Authority, explained that the environmental review document is supposed to scope out whatever potential impacts there are and figure out ways to mitigate them or consider them. The Sustainability Plan is really your vision. Some pieces may be environmentally significant and maybe some aren't, but it helps do things that we may want to do. The Transportation Element is much easier to talk about because there are some things that we are really excited about with the People Plan that are not going to be potentially significant environmentally, but will make walking feel more comfortable, make bicycle connections more convenient, and bike parking secure. You don't use a plan to talk about mitigating impacts and you don't use an environmental document to do planning. The environmental document gives a wide range of things that we can do as a city to be sustainable in our transportation planning, to be creative, and to be convenient. Then we are safe knowing that whatever ideas we come up with are comfortably within what has been analyzed for environmental impacts. The Sustainability Plan helps point out connections. There is a Transportation Plan, a Waste Management Plan, and then there are other plans that all have relationships. This Sustainability Plan is as Director Nutter said, is an umbrella. There are things that will be focused on in the Transportation Plan such as having frequent and reliable buses or having light rail be up and running on time. There are other things that we would like to do such as encouraging the purchase of carbon offsets when people fly into San Francisco. That is not necessarily in the Transportation Plan, but is something the Sustainability Plan can address.

Commissioner Wald stated that purchasing carbon offsets applies to the environmental impact of this event. People are going to come here from all over the world. If the EIR is to do a good job, it will have to talk about the consequences of people coming from all over the world. You should look to address what can be done to address people coming from all over the world, rather than mitigate the consequences. Mr. Albert stated that environmental documents talk about what can be controlled. You can say, we have to shut this street down and make more room for bicycles, and then the City agencies will do it. Other than those suggestions, it would be difficult for us to say that no-one can come to an event unless they buy carbon offsets. Commissioner Wald stated but you could say it is a goal to have at least 10% of people who come here to purchase carbon offsets and if you achieve that goal, this would be the result. Mr. Albert stated that environmental review is limited because it reviews something called level of service, which for example is how many vehicles are moving through an intersection. That is why the Plan is so important because the environmental document by CEQA law is very narrow in what it analyzes. If we were worried about how many cars are moving through an intersection, we would never get to talk about carbon offsets or the quality of the pedestrian environment. They go hand in hand. One is doing what the law needs you to do; the other is really setting the aspirations and goals.

Commissioner Wald stated that she needs some sense of how the environmental document and plan will be related. For example, if you have a goal to reach zero waste, what is it that is going to happen to make that goal a part of that event? There should be a plan in place for doing that, a plan that this Department and maybe other departments can marshal the troops that care about these issues to use the environmental document in the review process as a way to get principles and strategies part of the plan so there are results. There is no answer right now, but it is on our radar screen that there are these different processes that need to be connected and collaborated on so ideas are not missed and we do reach the end goal of having a real plan that has impact. Director Nutter stated that there is no answer right now, but it is on our radar screen that there are these different processes that need to be connected and collaborated on so ideas are not missed and we do reach the end goal of having a real plan that has impact.

Commissioner Wald stated that for example, if it looks like they are not going to do zero waste, and the plan says and people waving the plan say, you have to change this so you can do zero waste. You have to be careful that people don't hear that and when the EIR comes out, we are going to water down the plan so it matches the EIR. You want to make the end result match what is in the plan and lift the event to the level of the Sustainability Plan rather than the other way around.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that she appreciates that there is a difference between the mitigations that can be required by CEQA. She stated that Mr. Albert provided one example of how CEQA is very limited. Another is that CEQA doesn't require analyzing impacts on habitat that isn't labeled "sensitive habitat," or it doesn't require analyzing impacts on species that haven't been identified as "sensitive species." One of the things that have been talked about by the ACOC is that we want to go beyond CEQA because just doing what CEQA requires and the mitigations that will come out of the CEQA process will not be adequate to reach the level of sustainability that we all want. It is okay if the Sustainability Plan will have things in it that go beyond what is going to be in the EIR and required by the EIR. The concern is that the Sustainability Plan is not intended to impose requirements on the event, which brings up the question about how much energy should be put into something if it is not going to result in actions and will be seen by departments involved as visionary or aspirational. Ways should be identified to put some teeth into the Sustainability Plan in addition to what is in the EIR mitigations.

Public Comment
Ms. Jan Blum, interested party, stated that she has been following the America's Cup event and is interested in seeing it be a sustainable event for all concerned. One of the things that many of us are trying to get our arms around are definitive timelines and organizational charts so we know who is making decisions about what. It is hard for the public. It is now June 13 and the Sustainability Plan is expected to come out in July, so there is little time for feedback or commentary. Ms. Blum stated that it would be helpful for the public to know specifically what's coming out when, when comments are due, then what happens next. If the ACEA does not agree with the suggested sustainability practices, will they be able to not honor them? Who makes the decision about what is and not included? The complex organization is a mystery, who decides what and when? How does the City relate to the ACEA, who has the power? What is the role of the event management in decision making in terms of sustainability and practices put in place? The major concern would be that we have no teeth in making the right things happen.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether people can comment on the Draft Sustainability Plan at the same time as the publication of the Draft EIR. Director Nutter stated that people would be able to comment on the framework. An email address would be provided where comments could be submitted on the framework.

Mr. Michael Davis, U.S. Pure Water, inquired whether the outline addresses what is his main interest, restricting bottled water sales. Director Nutter reported that it does include this idea. Mr. Davis inquired whether these ideas would only be suggestions that are going to be made in regards to how the America's Cup is going to proceed with the different issues. He reported that U.S. Pure Water just did a bottled-water free event for the Harmony Festival in Sonoma County in Santa Rosa in which nine water

filling stations were provided. The success of that event was based on restricting vendors from selling bottled water. If that were not to be done, there would have been tons of single water bottles everywhere, and there were almost none. People were hydrated better than they had been at this festival than in the past because there were nine stations available to fill up with water. The festival averaged 8000 people every day, which may be smaller than America's Cup. It was a successful event and was the first time it was done for the Harmony Festival. People were happy to get free water everywhere they went. This is part of reclaiming the commons of water, which is an important statement to make, as well as the environmental impact of restricting all of those single-use bottles that get into the landfill or get shipped to China on a container, get burned, and toxic fumes created and called recycling. How do we restrict vendors from selling bottled water? There are ways to create enough permanent and temporary stations to allow people to fill up their bottles at convenient spots so they would be better hydrated than if bottled water were to be sold. He suggested that comments be made on how this can be accomplished.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether water bottles were supplied as part of the event promotion. Mr. Davis stated that no, there were promotional bottles available to be purchased at the site, but it was encouraged in all of the promotional material handed out before the event that people bring their own reusable bottle or reusable container, and a lot of people did. Compostable cups were available for a donation of $1 per cup, and there was a big five-gallon bottle to put money in. Most of the donation money went to Women's Earth Alliance, which is a non-profit organization that helps bring potable water to countries like Africa and India. It was in line with reclaiming the commons. It is also a good educational piece because if you have those compostable cups for people to use and they continuously grab them and throw them away, if they are paying for them, it gives them an idea about the value. Even though they are compostable they do require a lot of fossil fuels to be used to make them, and they don't break down well in a normal compost pile.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether there is a list of souvenirs that would be sold as part of the event or if anybody could sell what they want. Commissioner Gravanis inquired who would be contracting with the vendors.

Ms. Kyri McClellan, ACOC, reported that the America's Cup intellectual property, the rights that go with it, the t-shirts, the hats, trinkets etc. are a highly marketable and prized commodity, and the ACEA has the rights to the intellectual property. When you win the cup, you win the rights that go with it. Oracle Racing, that is sailing for the Golden Gate Yacht Club has created the ACEA, and they have the rights to create whatever merchandise they would like to sell. They are a relatively new organization as the ACOC is and are starting to put those pieces in place. The ACOC is endeavoring to introduce them to folks such as a local organic t-shirt manufacturer in San Francisco that might be able to help them produce their t-shirts so the product is

not only local but also a great product. ACOC's role is to help foster those relationships and make lots of introductions, but ultimately ACEC decides who their partners, are all with an eye towards creating revenue. Last year,

Ms. McClellan reported that last year, the City made a decision to not put General Fund resources into the event and to ultimately work with the ACOC and support the ACEA in finding corporate sponsors. It was reported that the General Fund does not have the ability to put money towards this event, so with that shifting, there is a little bit less control over some of these aspects. The ACOC is working on not only raising the funds that will be necessary, but also providing additional resources along with the Department of the Environment. That's why we have EAF, the Planning Conservation League, Save the Bay, 11th Hour Racing, and Sailors for the Sea. Part of the ACOC's work is to help resource venues (e.g. show-casing solar) and helping create the right partners so it can be an expo for great technology and environmental innovations. Work is being accomplished to fulfill the ACOC's obligations to support the exceptional work that the Department of the Environment has done to kick-start this effort. ACOC is working on a constrained timeframe and would not choose to do it this way, but commitments have to be met, and it is necessary to get to the point of making a decision whether it is viable.

Ms. McClellan explained that there are decisions that have to be made at the end of the CEQA process for the City and the ACEA. If there are mitigation requirements in the environmental review document that no longer makes this feasible or possible from a timeframe perspective, the ACEA and the City has the ability to say this isn't going to work. Work is being done to get to that decision point as quickly as possible in order to move forward with the implementation phase. At the same time, there are plans to bring folks together and have conversations about what we want this event to be in approximately 25 months from now. She appreciates the Commissioners comments and will bring them back to the ACEA.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired about the sale of souvenirs that the ACEA would be controlling and requirements for vendor permits. Who would vendors have to apply for permits from for example, to sell hot dogs in a booth on the Embarcadero?

Ms. McClellan stated that the Port would be the best entity to answer these questions since leases for this event would be issued by the Port for use of the piers. The City agreement states that leases would have to be approved by the Port and then the Board of Supervisors. The City is also negotiating a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the National Parks Trust for the use of their properties and would need a use permit that would be subject to CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Port would have to approve a permit to sell hotdogs along the Embarcadero. The ACEA is in the process of negotiating a lease with the Port for terms of use and what is called for in the City agreement. First CEQA has to be completed

and then leases negotiated for short-term use in addition to what happens in the future with long-term development rights just for the use of the property.

Commissioner Gravanis asked whether the Port could add to a food vendor concessionaire permit a prohibition on selling plastic water bottles. She explained that there is no ban on plastic water bottles, but in order to make America's Cup a sustainable event, there may be an agreement that issuing this prohibition is essential. What mechanism is available to make sure that this prohibition is added to permits?

Ms. McClellan stated that Port leases will be executed with the Event Authority. She explained that Mr. Adam Van deWater of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development is working with the Port on negotiation and execution of those leases. Commissioner Gravanis stated that she hopes that the Sustainability Plan would be the tool needed to make the Board do the right thing but is unsure if the Plan will have the power to do so and if the timing is right. Ms. McClellan stated that lease negotiations are in process now but won't be executed until after CEQA, so decisions can't be made until then. The timing is very close and parallel. In order for the event to be successful, CEQA needs to be finished before venue leases are put in place and construction will start.

Mr. Van deWater stated that the America's Cup was won by the Golden Gate Yacht Club, but technically America's Cup is not an official City project until it is cleared by CEQA. Once it is a project, permits will have to be filed with various agencies such as the Recreation and Park Department for the use of Marina Green and with the Port for the use of their piers. It may be necessary to go through the Intergovernmental Select Committee on Traffic and Transportation for control of the space around the piers. The merchandise and their real value are the trademarks, which is the event itself and selling the television rights to do that event. Then it is the merchandising, the sale of food and beverage that goes along with the estimated number of spectators. The City would love to see those vendors who sell food, beverages and logos where they are permitted on the Marina Green serve some of these spectators. They will have to be outside of that perimeter and not be on permitted land that the ACEA is using, but they could be still serving the public coming to the northeast of the City. This would require a separate Department of Public Works permit. That would be part of the economic impact and value of the City hosting the event where both parties have benefits.

Mr. Van deWater stated that persons coming to watch the event will be staying in San Francisco hotels and restaurants, which is where the City gets its value long-term. This will help improve the General Fund and is the economic benefit that a lot of people have been talking about. Commissioner Wald stated as well as the jobs that will be created.

Public Comment

Mr. David Pilpel (1) asked that ESA's PowerPoint presentation be provided to the Commission Secretary for the record; (2) stated that the EIR has to be approved by the Planning Commission, and there will be other bodies that review the EIR, but who has approval authority over the Sustainability Plan? and (3) since the Commission on the Environment sets policy for the Department, the Commission could decide that it is the policy of the Commission to approve or not approve the Sustainability Plan unless it does the following. He encouraged the Commission to engage in this exercise in its power as a Commission.

Director Nutter stated that she believes there is something in the host agreement that is titled the LEED plan, which is the Sustainability Plan. Director Nutter stated that the host agreement includes a LEED plan, which is essentially the same as the Sustainability Plan. It is the ACEA that has the responsibility for executing the Plan. She inquired with Mr. Van deWater if there is a process for approval of the plan. Mr. Van deWater stated that the host event agreement calls for nine different plans, e.g., the People Plan, LEED Plan, Waste Management and Zero Waste Plan, Security Plan, Advertising Plan, Marketing Plan, and there are two additional plans that have been recognized that are important to this conversation (1) the Public Access Management or Parks Plan relationship with the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) and National Park Service (NPS) for managing spectator volume; and (2) the Sustainability Plan, which is not specifically called for in the host venue agreement but was recognized early on to oversee the entire plan. Per the host venue agreement, there would be a LEED Plan, Waste Management Plan, and People Plan all of which have sustainability elements to them, but we would not have a Sustainability Plan. In order to live up to the commitment to be a zero waste sustainable event, a Sustainability Plan is being created that will address issues such as what is carbon neutral and how far do we cast that net, what do we mean in terms of waste diversion or reduction, what are we doing for the use of power both at the spectator areas and water, and how are we unifying all of this into one plan. In conversations with the Department of the Environment, the Event Authority, the Office of Economic Workforce Development, and others, it was decided that the Sustainability Plan will create that framework to help Ms. McClellan go to the marketplace to help fundraise for the City from a sustainability perspective and to help demonstrate that commitment to holding a sustainable event. The Sustainability Plan will be developed between the Department of the Environment and the Event Authority as part of this working group under the schedule that Ms. McClellan raised by which we have the white paper of what is required by local, state, and federal law and what we would like to see, such as refillable water stations, which is on the list. ESA was brought in as a technical consultant to make specific recommendations and fine tune suggestions.

Mr. Van deWater reported that a detailed Sustainability Plan outline will be published in the next couple of weeks, and then a Draft EIR issued in late June early July. There will be a timeframe for the comments and response period. There won't be the educational benefit of the comments and response period for the outline, but EIR comments can be included in the Sustainability Plan going forward.

Director Nutter stated that because what we are envisioning will be included in the Sustainability Plan on the building requirements specifically, it is possible that we could fulfill our commitments to the LEED plan by doing the Sustainability Plan. Commissioner Wald asked who would approve the Sustainability Plan. Is it the negotiation between the ACEA, Department of the Environment, and the ACOC? Who is the decider on the EIR? Mr. Van deWater responded the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Wald inquired whether the ACEA and ACOC will be influential voices in the decisions. Mr. Van deWater stated that he believes it will be jointly approved by the ACEA and the City through the Department of the Environment. Commissioner Wald asked whether it would be approved in a public venue. Mr. Van deWater stated that a series of public meetings will be held to solicit feedback on the Sustainability Plan.

Mr. Van deWater stated that the host venue agreement for the preliminary draft of the People Plan required it to be issued on March 31st. This was one of the first five plans to be issued. Subsequently, a progress report was issued based on the 35 public stakeholder meetings held in that intervening time and on comments received by email, in-person and in other meetings. Mr. Peter Albert is spearheading this effort and talking with regional transportation providers on impacts. Mr. Albert is working with the MTA on cost estimates and further refining those details. Three progress reports will be issued based on that preliminary draft over the next several months. The host venue agreement requires that the People Plan be delivered to the ACEA by December 30. The goal is to have three progress reports and the preliminary draft of the People Plan in the public realm with comments, responses, and actions to take, cost estimates, implementation strategies and deliver the Plan in early September for approval by September 30. A similar strategy is being thought about for the Sustainability Plan, where you have the EIR process, invite feedback on the plan, and continue to refine it from there.

Commissioner Wald suggested that the Commission on the Environment approve the Sustainability Plan since it is within its purview and expertise in order to give it a green seal of approval at a public hearing. Mr. Van deWater stated that would be up to Director Nutter. He reported that the ACEA is looking to host an athletic event within their expertise, which is sailing. They want to hold this event in San Francisco. The City has to permit that use so they have to go through a series of conditions largely codified in the event and host venue agreement. In addition, they have to apply for various permits and leases. The ACEA will meet the letter of local, state, and federal

laws and all of its requirements. The ACEA also wants this to be a green event and it is in their best interest in terms of marketing, sponsorship and everything else to have a green event, and they are committed to that. Having a green event sometimes comes with a cost so they are not going to do everything they are asked to do. The City perspective is to identify how to have a successful event that will fulfill the City's cultural interests and provide economic benefits in a sustainable manner.

Public Comment

Ms. Lorraine Palmer, Sea Scavenger Conservancy, reported that Sea Scavenger Conservancy is a non-profit project that focuses on the cleanup of ocean plastics. She asked if it is possible to indicate within these individual plans which line items or concepts in those plans are governed by the EIR and which ones are more aspirational. This would be a way to focus on items that may not be required in the mitigation, but may be important to advocate for. At what point do we know that the Sustainability Plan is not a part of the host agreement yet? Will the Sustainability Plan be adopted as part of a contractual item?

Mr. Adam Van deWater reported that the host venue agreement has been the guiding document ever since it was signed and has been agreed to by all of the three parties in this agreement, the City, ACOC, and ACEA. That is not to say that it can't evolve. We are here to say that the very concept of sustainability shows its evolution. Going back to amend it could take one or two actions. Increases to the financial obligations of the City would have to go through the Board of Supervisors since they adopted it as the City's level of commitment. If the activity defines it in a way that does not increase the City's financial exposure, it could be those three signatory parties that could make those amendments. The premise that has been operated under so far is that the Sustainability Plan clarifies commitments already made in the host and venue agreement, the LEED Plan, the Waste Management Plan, and the general commitments to make this a sustainable zero waste event. This Plan is our visionary framework and document for realizing those commitments. If we reach a point where we are proposing things that are reasonable and are conditions for the event to happen in San Francisco, and the ACEA indicates it won't do anything more than the basic letter of the law, a contractual amendment could be thought about. Right now we are operating under the shared purpose that we are creating something that is in their best interests and that of the City and we are working collaboratively to come up with solutions that will allow us to make this a green and sustainable event without making it cost prohibitive to them.

Mr. Van deWater stated that Director Nutter has had innovative ideas toward this end that would be low cost to the ACEA and would be high value to the City and the environment. Commissioner Wald stated that it is not presumed that you would change your relationship to the various bodies. Is it true that the additional

commitments would be put in writing? For example, if the parties decide they are going to have fuel cells on Marina Green, aren't they going to put that in writing so no-one that goes to the event finds old engines being used. Mr. Van deWater stated that we need to connect the vision to the implementation. Previous tenants of Marina Green have requested a greener technology for their events. In years past, the company that sets up special events for the Opera or a corporate function has not known of a vendor that will supply the power requirements without using diesel generators. Maybe that has changed and we can ask one of these tech companies to emphasize their product at the event. What we don't want to do is say to the ACEA that you have to have green power on the Marina Green as a condition for hosting the event when there is no supplier available.

Commissioner Wald stated that if everybody agrees that there is a vendor and if everybody agrees that using that vendor is a good thing, it could be part of the contract between the parties. Director Nutter stated it could be part of some agreement. Commissioner Wald stated that if you show up during the event and if they are not using the vendor that everyone said should be used you could point to the document that says the vendor that wouldn't use diesel generators was supposed to be used. She stated she does not know when and how this will happen or in what document.

Ms. Palmer stated there is a law that requires zero discharge of marine debris. She hasn't seen that requirement in any plans yet or does not know if it is being addressed. She stated that when she looks at these plans, she wants to know what is being required by the EIR, where it is being addressed, and if it's optional, why. She wants to know what is governing it. Commissioner Wald stated that it sounds like it will be in the EIR because it part of a law, policy, or regulation. Commissioner Wald stated that EIR will be useful for allowing us to walk between what is required and what isn't. Ms. Palmer stated it will clearly distinguish what is required and aspirational.

Public Comment

Mr. Stephen Krefting, former Environment Commissioner, representing the Presidio Environmental Council, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters, and participant in the Council of Environmental Organizations working on the America's Cup. He stated that he sometimes wishes that San Francisco was more like New York in that while our city limits go past Treasure Island, go up to Red Rock, and take in a slither of Angel Island, we don't control Sausalito, Oakland, or Alameda. How do we know that financial remediation will be provided to the National Park Service and Golden Gate National Recreation Area for significant impacts on their land? Are they going to be making any money off of the sites that will be used for the event? There are legal limits to the jurisdiction of the Commission on the Environment, but we need to keep in mind throughout all of these discussions, ways to fund what is necessary all around the bay

in terms of protecting the environment. You don't want vendors in Sausalito to hand out plastic bags to shoppers or plastic bottles to float in the bay. You have to identify a way to make agreements with other entities to share common rules about how these things are done and to see if the transportation agencies will talk to each other and coordinate in a good fashion. There is great potential in the use of Golden Gate Transit that has been untapped for many years and in legacy improvements to transportation, in particular to the Presidio. The money needs to go to other communities as well.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether the City is coordinating with other entities. Director Nutter stated that our Department is not doing so yet. A discussion has been held about having a network of sustainability directors in the Bay Area who meet on a regular basis and using that platform to talk about what activities in San Francisco can be exported to other cities. We don't have control over other jurisdictions, but we can share best practices and thinking around sustainability, which we plan to do.

Mr. Albert stated that one of the legacies we hope to leave with the America's Cup is the way the region and San Francisco work together. The second regional transportation provider's meeting that focuses on how well we are all cooperating with the America's Cup will be held tomorrow. He reported that the Executive Director of the Municipal Transportation Commission pointed out that America's Cup is a Bay Area event, not a San Francisco event and makes a great impact on transportation. What is interesting is how much support we are getting from the regional transportation providers, not just BART, CalTrain, Golden Gate Transit, but also CalTrans and the Municipal Transportation Commission. Some ideas you will be seeing shortly is the Clipper Card being extended universally so it is an unlimited or extended Clipper Card and is invisible whether you are on a bus, ferry, or BART. Work is in progress to extend that to bike sharing. There is interest in innovative ideas that are happening in the region. Golden Gate Transit is limited in the way it can serve San Francisco. It can pick up people in Marin and drop them off in San Francisco, but can't pick up people in San Francisco and drop them off in San Francisco. Because this is an extraordinary event, we are getting agreements and support for pioneering Golden Gate Transit as another transit vehicle on the street and to allow for the use of the Clipper Card to help people move from one part of Van Ness Avenue to another. If this were a permanent transportation plan there might be more anxiety, but because people recognize how extraordinary this event is and if this idea did not work out, we could say we gave it a good try and would give us more comfort and flexibility in pioneering these agreements between the region and the City. We will be seeing a lot of these ideas come in from the public.

Mr. Albert stated that at the end of June, there will be a second progress report where it is hoped to make clear what agreements were worked out with the regional transportation providers. It is hoped that will be a good example for the Sustainability

Plan. The agreements that have been worked out between the City and the region through the People Plan will be a mini legacy for the long term legacy of all plans working together.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired that if the Department of the Environment and the ACEA agree that the Sustainability Plan will call for no releases of helium balloons for example, are the people in Marin County going to feel like they need to pay attention to that agreement? She stated that she would like to see early negotiations and discussions and communication to make sure that nobody in Marin County or Oakland are going to say, who does the Department of the Environment think they are, to be the one city involved in the Sustainability Plan and then tell us what to do.

Mr. Van deWater stated that Mr. Albert has been coordinating the People Plan with all the transportation providers and other cities. Similar efforts have been done with the Security Plan to engage the region in terms of their local police and sheriff's departments, the marine units, Highway Patrol, FBI, Secret Service, etc. Similarly a general cast was done for involvement of all local governments. There has been outreach to city managers and planning commissioners from the north, east and south bays. This has not been accomplished yet with the Sustainability Plan but has been on other plans developed, e.g. the People and Security Plans. Since this event is in San Francisco Bay, it will have regional impacts.

Public Comment

Ms. Lurilla Harris inquired about the entity responsible for handling the security. Mr. Van deWater reported that the Deputy Chief of Operations will be coordinating with various law enforcement agencies throughout the region, country and state. It will be a large effort for the local police, the regional highway patrol, and possibly will require federal involvement.

Ms. Jan Blum inquired whether there would be coordination with the Park Service. Mr. Van deWater concurred. There would be shared manpower between the park police, California, state and federal agencies. Discussions have been held about having volunteer traffic control, so the law enforcement can do law enforcement and not just pointing people in the right direction. The Chief of Operations has been holding regular briefings and working on getting all hands on deck in order to have a coordinated effort.

Mr. Pilpel suggested that the next time America's Cup is brought back to the Commission, that the Plan should be tied in better with specific smaller actions, not the EIR approval and mitigations, but the DPW and Recreation and Park Department permits. That is where the details will come out.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether the Draft Sustainability Plan will be available by the next Policy Committee meeting on July 11. Director Nutter reported that a framework document should be available soon. Commissioner Wald inquired whether public hearings would be held. Director Nutter stated that a discussion should be held on the process between the three parties. The discussion of the Sustainability Planning framework was continued to the July 11 Policy Committee meeting.

5. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Continued from the May 9, 2011 Meeting) Sponsor: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Monica Fish, Commission Secretary (Explanatory Document: Memo to Policy Committee and Commission Outreach Draft List) (Informational Report and Discussion)

This agenda item was continued to the July 11, 2011 Meeting.

6. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

Director Nutter reported that she had attended a C40 Climate Summit in Sao Paulo Brazil last week. There were fifty-seven cities from around the world talking about sustainability efforts in their cities. She presented on the City's Zero Waste and received a phenomenal response from people congratulating San Francisco on their great work and how we are leading the way internationally. Ms. Partin was also in attendance presenting on Green Taxis. Announcements were made that (1) the World Bank would be participating in and supporting cities in their sustainability plans; and (2) ICLEI would be coming out with a tool for all cities to track their carbon.

Director Nutter announced that an Ordinance was filed to repeal the 1932 Ordinance that governs our current waste system. In the name of competitive billing, it would split up Recology's current control over the system, which has helped us get to our 77% diversion rate. The City Attorney is reviewing the Ordinance, and information is being prepared about what the effect will be on our zero waste system.

Director Nutter introduced Department of Public Works Director Ed Reiskin to discuss an issue that Commissioners have expressed an interest in about a proposal related to management of street trees. Ms. Hui, Urban Forestry Council Coordinator, is in attendance to speak on this issue.

Public Comment

Mr. Reiskin, Director, Department of the Public Works (DPW) stated that DPW is responsible under the Urban Forestry Ordinance, which is part of the Public Works Code, for management and stewardship of the City's urban forest. Staff are dedicated and committed to this effort and understand the importance of a very

healthy and strong urban forest. The way the urban forest is managed right now from a maintenance perspective is that there are about 90,000 street trees in San Francisco, about 2/3 of which are the maintenance responsibility of private property owners. The other 1/3 are maintained by the government. There are reasons for why the majority is maintained by private property owners and others by the government, but it does not explain the situation. DPW right now has 11 arborists maintaining approximately 30,000 trees. With the current staffing, there is ability to trim trees on an average of every 10 – 12 years. The industry standard for maintaining trees would require maintenance every three to five years. There is less than half the capacity to adequately maintain those 30,000 trees. He discussed budget cuts that DPW has had to face in every aspect of its operation. There are now only 11 people to maintain those 30,000 trees which is not adequate or responsible. The fact that most are maintained by private property owners is also not an equitable provision of government service.

Mr. Reiskin stated that he is proposing under his authority under the Public Works Code to relinquish responsibility of those trees to private property owners. The Urban Forestry Ordinance lays out a procedure by which that can happen which includes the government making sure that the trees are in good condition before they are relinquished. There are noticing requirements, opportunities for a public hearing for each and any individual who requests one to review the decision of the government to relinquish. Because of the requirement to get the trees in good condition before relinquishment, it is projected that it would take DPW seven years to relinquish on the order of 24,000 street trees, which may be an ambitious target. It is proposed that the process is started to return the 1/3 or a portion of the 1/3 of trees back to the private property owners so they would be maintaining trees just as the other two thirds of those that have street trees in front of their houses.

The Mayor's proposed budget in this fiscal year requires an additional DPW budget reduction for street trees. The 11 arborist will be reduced to 7 that are responsible for maintaining these 30,000 trees, but even without a budget cut, the trees cannot be maintained adequately. There are concerns about how well private property owners maintain their trees and is a matter of debate. DPW maintains that it maintains trees better even in its diminished capacity than private property owners. Currently, 2/3s are being maintained by private property owners, so a radical shift is not being made. A better long-term strategy is being seen for the City to have the funds to maintain the entire urban forest and all of the 90,000 street trees. There are ways that other cities have approached this through a landscape assessment district. The City of Oakland has one for part of their urban forest, and other cities have them. To have a dedicated funding source to properly, consistently and professionally maintain all of the street trees would be DPW's recommendation and preference in the long-term. Until that happens, DPW is trying to bring the amount of street tree assets more in line with the resources available to maintain them. Mr. Reiskin stated that he requested the

hearing on this topic at the City Operations and Neighborhood Services earlier today and the issue will probably be discussed at DPW's budget hearing next Monday.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether any of these trees that would be relinquished are ones that were planted under the FACE or the RAP program in the 1960's and 70's. Mr. Reiskin reported he does not know the details of those programs, but a lot of the trees are in current or former redevelopment areas, which is one of the reasons they came into the City's responsibility. Commissioner Gravanis stated that many of these trees were planted without the permission of the property owner, which is a different situation than the trees that were planted through Friends of the Urban Forest or other programs where the property is involved in the decision. She asked how to deal with the surprise by private property owners. How does the fine for chopping down a tree without a permit compare to the annual cost of maintaining a street tree? It may be that a lot of people would remove a tree in order to avoid the cost of maintenance or the liability of someone tripping over the sidewalk if the tree caused a lot of root damage. Mr. Reiskin stated that he believes the fine for illegal removal starts at $1400. Annual maintenance costs vary quite a bit. DPW has been encouraging in recent years planting lower-maintenance trees particularly in terms of how they break up the sidewalk. Generally, the costs are not onerous. It will be more difficult for those of lower income than for others. Right now property owners are responsible for maintenance of sidewalks. This issue was raised by the City a couple of years ago at which point the City was saying that if you don't want to maintain the tree, come and get a removal permit. That is certainly not a policy that DPW is supportive of or that is consistent with a number of City plans, e.g., the Better Streets Plan. Generally, the removal of a healthy tree would not be permitted.

Commissioner Gravanis asked if DPW would be dealing with all of the paperwork, such as 3R reports in terms of people purchasing a home with a tree in front of it, to make sure that they will know that they will be assuming maintenance responsibility of that tree. Mr. Reiskin stated that right now everybody is responsible for their sidewalk and most people are responsible if there is a tree in front of it. He is unsure how that flows through the real estate process. Commissioner Gravanis stated you would not want to take the risk of surprising people. She stated that the Policy Committee had a discussion about work stalling on the Urban Forest Plan and the idea that if we don't have money to do the whole plan and focus on street tree maintenance, to give consideration to a landscape assessment district by which private property owners would be able to pay into a fund that would result in a lot less cost per tree because of the economy of scale, and the ability of a professional landscape company that would be able to do a whole block at once. It was hoped that would be picked up by the Urban Forestry Council or DPW. Isn't it conceivable to put that in the books within the seven years to focus attention on first? Mr. Reiskin stated that these discussions have been held and research held on steps that would be required, and even laying out a timeline. Support would be needed from elected officials and the

Board because it will require their approval. He spoke in support of this program but stated that it would take time to accomplish. There has not been that much interest in making this happen because of the current economy. If the economy were to rebound, it might be a good time to advance it.

Commissioner Wald stated that it would make more sense to consider this type of program before trees are relinquished so you wouldn't have to take them back at a future time. Consider which trees might be more appropriate to give up, such as ones that are unsuitable for the places they are located, and then have a conversation with a landowner about a more targeted program that would be consistent with the kind of program you would like to have and goals for those programs. Where is the impetus for the landscape assessment district going to come once you announce that trees will be relinquished? Mr. Reiskin stated that people think that if the government is maintaining my tree now for free, they would certainly be less inclined to support an assessment district. As trees will be relinquished, there will be more people who would stand to benefit. He is unsure how trees can be relinquished strategically so that it works better in the future. DPW would have to get the trees in good shape to relinquish. Even for the trees that are not well suited to the environment, there is reluctance to encourage people to cut them down if they are healthy. Unless the tree is causing a safety hazard, causing significant property damage or has space constraints that can't be addressed, an application to remove a tree that is otherwise healthy will be rejected.

Ms. Mei Ling Hui, Urban Forestry Council Coordinator distributed DPW Tree Plan Fact Sheets. She discussed the concerns expressed at the Board of Supervisors Committee meeting today on the plan. Most of the public spoke against the plan and noted costs, tree size, sidewalk and tree maintenance concerns. Commissioner Wald asked in the case when the property owner is not responsible for the tree, would they not be responsible for the sidewalk? Mr. Reiskin stated that a private property owner is not responsible for damage to the sidewalk caused by the tree if it's a city-maintained tree. If a sidewalk is cracked and it is not related to the tree, then it is the property owner's responsibility. If a tree is breaking up or lifting a sidewalk, that is the City's responsibility if it is a City-maintained tree.

7. **Announcements.** (Discussion) This agenda topic was not discussed at this time.

8. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion) Future agenda items discussed for the July 11 meeting included (1) review of the Outreach List; (2) Sustainability Framework for the America's Cup; and (3) Balloon Ordinance update. Agenda item requests discussed for the August meeting included (1) factual data on the Bag Ordinance, (2) Commission on the Environment Retreat follow-up; and (3) Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan. Director Nutter stated that there is a case pending at the state level that is supposed to be resolved in September that may

direct the timing on the bag issue. This case would dictate how much money a City would have to invest in CEQA review of a bag ban or additions to a bag ordinance. Commissioner Gravanis reported that the Bird-safe Building Guidelines would be coming to the Planning Commission soon and pointed out that the Commission was not able to weigh in on it because the Commission was advised that it was not allowed to talk about window treatments for saving birds. It was suggested that one or two Policy Committee meetings be devoted to Charter provision interpretations.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel stated that he attended a briefing of SFMade which is an organization that promotes local manufacturing. He suggested that this type of discussion be incorporated into the Sustainability Plan and all activities within the Department. He suggested a discussion on the Commission's policy goals, which was on the Retreat agenda but not discussed.

9. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

10. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

espectfully submitted by,
Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
elephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

he next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for londay, July 11, 2011at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, an Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's ebsite https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee with each set of inutes, or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via -mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org.

pproved: August 8, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 27 2011
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING AND AGENDA
MONDAY, JULY 11, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOOLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS
Public comment will be taken before the Committee takes action on any item.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.**
2. **Approval of Minutes of the June 13, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: June 13, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)
3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
4. **America's Cup Sustainability Planning Framework Updates.** Sponsor and Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)
5. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Continued from the June 13, 2011 Meeting) Sponsors: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis (Explanatory Document: Memo to Policy Committee and Commission Outreach Draft List) (Informational Report and Discussion)
6. **Purposes of Commission Outreach List and Criteria for Inclusion.** Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speakers: Commissioner Gravanis and Director Nutter (Discussion)
7. **Commission on the Environment Retreat Follow-up--Evaluation of Retreat and Recommendations for the Future.** The Committee may make recommendations to the full Commission. Sponsors: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis and Director Nutter; Speaker: Director Nutter (Discussion and Possible Action)
8. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

SF Environment, a Department of the City and County of San Francisco
11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 355-3700 • Fax: (415) 554-6393
Email: environment@sfgov.org • www.sfenvironment.org
100% Post-Consumer Recycled Paper

9. **Announcements.** (Discussion)
10. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)
11. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
12. **Adjournment.**

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary, Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 8, 2011at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee , or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org within three business days of a meeting. If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Commission Policy Committee after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Department of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 during normal office hours or will be made available at the Policy Committee meeting website link https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee as attachments included with the agenda or meeting minutes.

Important Information

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cel phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the Committee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Committee members. Any written comments should be sent to: Commission Secretary of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Comments which cannot be delivered to the Commission Secretary by that time may be taken directly to the hearing at the location above. When bringing handouts to meetings, please photocopy on both sides of the paper and try to use post-consumer recycled or tree-free paper. Also, please bring sufficient copies of handouts for the Committee, the Commission Secretary and the public.

Public Comment

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but are not on today's agenda. Public comment will be taken following each agendized item. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes, unless otherwise announced by the Chair. If it is demonstrated that the comments by the public will exceed 15 minutes, the Chair may continue Public Comment to another time during the meeting.

The Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue not appearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In response to public comment, not on an agendized item, the Committee is limited to:

1. Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
2. Request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
3. Directing staff to place the item or issue on a future agenda (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Disability Access

The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meeting will be held at City Hall, Room 421, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, in the Civic Center area. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the Civic Center Station at United Nations Plaza and Market Street. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro Stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For information about MUNI accessible services call (415) 923-6142. There is accessible curbside parking adjacent to City Hall on Grove Street and Van Ness Avenue and in the vicinity of the Veterans Building at 401 Van Ness Avenue adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Monica Fish at (415) 355-3709 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call the Mayor's Office on Disability at (415) 554-6789 or (415) 554-6799 (TTY) for further information.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance
(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduc the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before th people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information o your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contac the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Sunshine Task Force Administrator, City Hall, Room 409, Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683 at Phone No.: (415) 554-7724 Fax No.: (415) 554-7854; E-mail: sotf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can b obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and o the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3112; web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Posted: June 27, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.
A Department of the City and County of San Francisco

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

Melanie Nutter
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

CANCELLED MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, JULY 11, 2011, 5:00 p.m.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

The Monday, July 11, 2011, 5:00 p.m. meeting of the Commission on the Environment's Policy Committee was CANCELLED due to a lack of quorum. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 8, 2011, at 5:00 p.m. at City Hall, Room 421. Please contact the Commission Secretary, Monica Fish, at 415-355-3709 or Monica.Fish@sfgov.org if you would like to be placed on the agenda mailing list for future meetings. An agenda may also be accessed on the Commission website at https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee.

Posted: July 18, 2011

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUL 18 2011
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING AND AGENDA
MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS DEPT
AUG - 3 2011
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS
Public comment will be taken before the Committee takes action on any item.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.**
2. **Approval of Minutes of the June 13, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: June 13, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)
3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
4. **Climate Program Update.** Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speaker: Adam Stern, Climate Program Manager (20 minutes) (Informational Report and Discussion)
5. **Commission on the Environment Retreat Follow-up--Evaluation of Retreat and Recommendations for the Future.** The Committee may make recommendations to the full Commission. Sponsors: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis and Director Nutter; Speaker: Director Nutter (15 minutes) (Discussion and Possible Action)
6. **Update on InSight Campaign.** Sponsor Director Nutter; Speaker: Maggie Weiland, Public Relations and Outreach Assistant (10 minutes)
7. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Continued from the June 13, 2011 Meeting) Sponsors: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis (Explanatory Document: Memo to Policy Committee and Commission Outreach Draft List) (Informational Report and Discussion)

8. **Purposes of Commission Outreach List and Criteria for Inclusion.** Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speakers: Commissioner Gravanis and Director Nutter (Discussion)
9. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Repor and Discussion)
10. **Announcements.** (Discussion)
11. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)
12. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
13. **Adjournment.**

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 12, 2011at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee , or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org within three business days of a meeting. If any materials related to an item or this agenda have been distributed to the Commission Policy Committee after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Department of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 during normal office hours or will be made available at the Policy Committee meeting website link https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee as attachments included with the agenda or meeting minutes.

Important Information

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or othe similar sound-producing electronic devices.

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the Committee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Committee members. Any written comments should be sent to: Commission Secretary of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Comments which cannot be delivered to the Commission Secretary by that time may be taken directly to the hearing at the location above. When bringing handouts to meetings, please photocopy on both sides of the paper and try to use post-consumer recycled or tree-free paper. Also, please bring sufficient copies of handouts for the Committee, the Commission Secretary and the public.

Public Comment

.t this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within ıe subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but are not on today's agenda. Public comment will e taken following each agendized item. Each member of the public may address the Committee or up to three minutes, unless otherwise announced by the Chair. If it is demonstrated that the omments by the public will exceed 15 minutes, the Chair may continue Public Comment to another me during the meeting.

ıe Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue not ıppearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In esponse to public comment, not on an agendized item, the Committee is limited to:

1. Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
2. Request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
3. Directing staff to place the item or issue on a future agenda (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Disability Access

he Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meeting will be held at City Hall, Room 421,)ne Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, in the Civic Center area. The meeting oom is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the Civic Center Station at Inited Nations Plaza and Market Street. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro Stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For information about MUNI accessible services call (415) 923-6142. here is accessible curbside parking adjacent to City Hall on Grove Street and Van Ness Avenue and ı the vicinity of the Veterans Building at 401 Van Ness Avenue adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex.

he following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday neetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: or American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Monica Fish at (415) 355-3709 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be ıonored, if possible.

n order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental lnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are eminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help he City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities hould call the Mayor's Office on Disability at (415) 554-6789 or (415) 554-6799 (TTY) for further nformation.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance
(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and hat City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the

Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Tas Force, Sunshine Task Force Administrator, City Hall, Room 409, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Sa Francisco, CA 94102-4683 at Phone No.: (415) 554-7724; Fax No.: (415) 554-7854; E-mai sotf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshin Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative actior may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3112; web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Posted: August 3, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

AUG 23 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES
MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:05 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Excused: Commissioner Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the June 13, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: June 13, 2011 Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald the June 13, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash).

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

4. **Climate Program Update.** Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speaker: Adam Stern, Climate Program Manager (Explanatory Document: Climate Program Presentation to Policy Committee) (Informational Report and Discussion)

Mr. Stern reported on the Department of the Environment's reorganization to bring together three program areas: climate, renewable energy and green building. He provided an overview of goals, objectives, progress, timelines, and next steps for each (Presentation Slides 2 – 6).

- Climate: assess progress on 2012 greenhouse gas reduction goals; update Climate Action Plan in consultation with other City agencies and expand web presence; revitalize 2009 Carbon Fund to support new carbon-reduction projects in San Francisco; and initiate adaptation planning with assistance of a consultant, involving key city agencies, and working with the Mayor's Office on developing a scope of work.

- Renewable Energy: work with Mayor's Renewable Energy Task Force to develop plan for generating 100% of electricity used in San Francisco from renewable sources; launch Solar@Work program enabling small and medium-size businesses to benefit from group solar purchase discounts; streamline the solar permitting process; expand online renewable energy maps; and reduce natural gas use.

- Green Building: legislation before the Board of Supervisors to require LEED Gold for all municipal projects; work with the Department of Building Inspection to monitor private-sector compliance with green building codes; implement the existing Commercial Building ordinance to benchmark and track energy performance focusing initially on the city's largest buildings; implement Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing for commercial buildings and reestablish residential program; and work with Business Council on Climate Change to distribute a Green Tenant toolkit.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired about new carbon fund projects being considered and suggested that projects be made available for the America's Cup event so that it can be as carbon-neutral as possible. Mr. Stern reported on three carbon fund projects under review: (1) expand tree planting efforts and improve our urban green park areas to show carbon benefits and improve the environment and quality-of-life for city residents; (2) accelerate the deployment of electric vehicle charging stations; and (3) expand the use of biodiesel especially with City fleets by accelerating the development of the necessary fuel tanks. It is hoped that a strong Carbon Fund program will be in place in time for the America's Cup organizers to consider and serve as an opportunity to build support for carbon-reduction efforts. Director Nutter reported that the America's Cup Organizing Committee committed to offsetting its travel to Cascais, Portugal for the current round of races through the San Francisco Carbon Fund.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that the America's Cup event provides an opportunity to raise awareness about the San Francisco Bay Delta estuary. A discussion was held about sea-level rise and greenhouse gas emission impacts to our wetlands and shoreline habitat and the importance of providing places for habitats to retreat to. She stated that in addition to tree-planting projects, wetland restoration and other restoration projects be considered as carbon fund projects and suggested consulting with Literacy for Environmental Justice, the Port of San Francisco, and other City agencies toward these efforts.

Commissioner Wald suggested that an effort be made to advise people on opportunities to help realize Climate Action Plan goals. She asked whether there is a way to use people's interest in the America's Cup to encourage participation in the development of the plan or adherence to its goals. Mr. Stern reported that San Francisco's progress toward achieving reduction goals that will soon be shared and validated with other City agencies who will be encouraged to develop new recommendations and strategies for the City to adopt for goals beyond 2012. A completed strategy and updated Climate Action Plan will be available towards the end of the year. Work is currently in progress on how to best present this information on the web for the public to access and act on. The America's Cup event provides an opportunity to fit into this process. Mr. Stern said he expects that San Francisco's progress in reducing GHGs would exceed goals set by the U.N. Kyoto Protocol and California's Assembly Bill 32 (AB32), and that this progress would motivate people to continue San Francisco's leadership in this area.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired about the locations being considered for implementation of district heating. Mr. Stern reported that an opportunity exists at the Transbay Terminal development site. Director Nutter reported that three additional potential sites to evaluate are Treasure Island, Bayview Hunters Point, and the 4th Street Corridor. Commissioner Gravanis suggested holding discussions with developers of Seawall Lot 337 (San Francisco Giants Ballpark A, Mission Rock). Director Nutter reported on a Vancouver policy requiring assessment of district heating and cooling opportunities for all developments that meet certain criteria as a way to accelerate district heating and cooling. Commissioner Wald suggested that more incentives are needed for this program and inquired whether LEED points would be issued.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired about the role that Commissioners can take toward these efforts. Mr. Stern reported that as progress is made in these initiatives, he would like to return to the Commission for their guidance and experience on strategies being considered. Commissioner Wald suggested that the Commission have a more active role as appropriate and possibly be asked to participate in meetings as needed.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel suggested that (1) as a way to integrate activities, staff should issue regular reports to the Committee on efforts by other bodies that the

Department staffs, e.g., the Urban Forestry Council, Resource Efficiency Building Task Force, and Biodiesel Access Task Force; (2) direct the Climate Action Plan not only to City departments, but to businesses and individuals who also impact results; (3) localize the manufacturing and production of America's Cup souvenirs, manufactured goods, and food products to reduce transportation impacts of offshore products. Commissioner Wald suggested that Mr. Stern develop and encourage partnerships with non-profit and environmental organizations to further program goals.

5. **Commission on the Environment Retreat Follow-up--Evaluation of Retreat and Recommendations for the Future.** The Committee may make recommendations to the full Commission. Sponsors: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis and Director Nutter; Speaker: Director Nutter (Discussion and Possible Action)

Commissioners and Director Nutter discussed the June 9, 2011 retreat topics that focused on the Department's outreach and communication methods to the public in the areas of Commercial and Zero Waste, EnvironmentNow, San Francisco Home Improvement Performance (SFHIP), Toxics Residential Shade Tree Mechanics, and Greening the Dry Cleaning Business. Commissioners relayed the importance of communications metrics and reporting in order to monitor success of Department programs. The agenda topic of reviewing the Commission's accomplishments and policy goals was not heard at that meeting and was continued for discussion.

Commissioners provided their recommendations for future retreat and/or meeting/workshop topics, format, and content. Key points of discussion included:

- The amount of information presented should be structured in a way that Commissioners are better able to express their opinions and provide suggestions, e.g. not too much or too little information.

- The Department has so many programs and projects that the Commission could be apprised of. In an effort to prioritize staff time, differentiate between report formats to the Commission, e.g. written or oral.

- Consider discussing traditional retreat topics such as assessing Commission accomplishments of the past year and plan for future goals. Consider scheduling retreat topics at regular meetings of the Commission.

- Discuss the Commission's and Committee's role in identifying, implementing, and setting policy for inclusion in the Strategic Plan. Review Commission Charter provisions and identify what Commissioners would like to see as Department goals once resources become available and if not available, establish policies and identify fundraising opportunities.

- Discussion was held on the evolution of the Department from identifying policies and policy setting to management, communications and implementation of policy. How the Commission can play a role in current and future policy making; e.g., America's Cup, Commercial Building Ordinance, Yellow Pages Ordinance, identifying campaigns and policy around consumption and zero waste.

- Consider focused in-depth workshops on particular topics and publicize the agenda to a targeted audience; e.g., environmental organizations that are interested in that topic.

- Create Department programs and discussions around the natural environment.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel expressed his agreement with comments and observations. He suggested that the Committee (1) hold a discussion about establishing a campaign encouraging people to make conscious choices about consumption; (2) identify a roadmap for Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) and zero waste; (3) discuss creating more Department programs around the natural environment; and (4) hold discussions with City agencies on how land management policies relate to environmental values. Commissioner Gravanis suggested formulating collaborative relationships with City agencies around environmental goals and issues such as land management. Commissioner Wald suggested that the InSight campaign interview people about what they think about when they decide to make a purchase.

6. **Update on InSight Campaign.** Sponsor Director Nutter; Speaker: Maggie Weiland, Public Relations and Outreach Assistant

Ms. Weiland, InSight Project Coordinator, reported on the InSight retreat that was held with the Director, the Outreach team, and InSight program staff to discuss the campaign's top priorities and action plan. Main elements of the action plan included (1) continued maintenance and promotion of the campaign within Department staff, other City departments, and the community through the online forum Ideas4SF; (2) a door-hanger project directed to San Francisco residents to engage ideas through another medium other than the internet; and (3) continued community outreach and in-person communication with the public. On-line forum statistics were provided on the number of users and number of ideas generated, and success of the campaign will be quantified using those metrics. She reported on her work managing the forum and reading and delegating ideas to appropriate Department staff in order to formulate concise replies.

Commissioners provided suggestions on the online forum as follows:

- Manage expectations. Provide users with instructions on how to use the online forum, if and when a response will be issued. Provide quality assurance of responses by managing or cross-referencing duplicates.

- Provide direction on the forum about what the Department plans to do with the ideas provided, whether responses will be shared with other agencies, and when appropriate, refer people to the appropriate agency. Inform participants how many votes total they would be allowed to make; how many different ideas they would be allowed to vote for.

- Share comments and work with other City agencies on formulating responses.

- Structure the website in a way to provide regular updates and gage progress on ideas.

Director Nutter reported that the objective of the campaign is for the Department of the Environment to facilitate and create a forum for the community to share their sustainability ideas, and ideas will be responded to whenever possible. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that this information be added to the online forum in order to manage expectations. Ms. Weiland stated that another objective of the forum is to generate topics around innovative ideas and connect users back to existing programs.

Ms. Weiland discussed the door hanger project that will serve as an opportunity to generate interest and attain a wide scope of feedback. It will help reach out to individuals who do not use the internet, underserved neighborhoods, increase participation in programs, and increase the number of people on mailing lists and newsletters. Commissioner Gravanis discussed safety and security concerns of door hangers and asked that training be provided to ensure that door hangers are not placed on residences that have "Post No Bills" signs. Commissioner Wald stated that it is important to tell people what will be done with the information provided and to integrate the number of door-hanger responses into the website. She suggested adding InSight campaign information to water bill or Recology bill inserts as an alternative.

Ms. Weiland discussed the in-person communication campaign to generate interest and participation in Department programs. She reported that she along with four staff/interns attended thirty community events in the past two-and-a-half months, conducting 500 surveys asking the same questions that the online forum asks. Success of this campaign is being quantified, and more community outreach is planned.

Director Nutter discussed plans to engage the new Mayor's administration in this campaign by relaying top ideas, holding an event with the new Mayor and the

community on plans for ideas; and working with the Mayor to adopt and implement ideas. Commissioner Gravanis cautioned against making any suggestion that the number of votes an item got should indicate the value of that idea. Commissioner Wald suggested that Department staff provide the Mayor with an expert opinion on ideas and show the level of community support as well as a roadmap for implementation.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel stated that (1) he appreciates the door hanger and web campaign, and that it would be interesting to compare response rates from different communication channels to different communities; (2) spoke in support of the handout developed for the Earth Day breakfast that has information on all of the Department's programs and suggested adding the Ideas4SF campaign to that handout and distributing it at all events that staff attends; (3) discussed the Public Library's referral to the Department as part of the BagIt film as an effective overall communication strategy that other City departments should engage in; and (4) reported that Mr. Westlund, Program Outreach Manager, is leaving the Department to work at the Sierra Club as the Deputy National Communications Director and asked that the Department review its outreach organizational structure.

Agenda Items 7 – 9 were continued to the September 12, 2011 meeting.

7. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Continued from the June 13, 2011 Meeting) Sponsors: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis (Explanatory Document: Memo to Policy Committee and Commission Outreach Draft List) (Informational Report and Discussion). Continued to the September 12, 2011 meeting.

8. **Purposes of Commission Outreach List and Criteria for Inclusion.** Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speakers: Commissioner Gravanis and Director Nutter (Discussion). Continued to the September 12, 2011 meeting.

9. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion) Continued to the September 12, 2011 meeting.

10. **Announcements.** (Discussion) This agenda item was not heard at this time.

11. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion) Agenda items discussed for the September 12 meeting included the Outreach List discussion; Committee review of the America's Cup Sustainability Draft Plan if complete; and Commissioner Gravanis will speak on biodiversity. Director Nutter reported that the Zero Waste team has asked that the Committee hold a discussion on the use of Impound Account funds for litter cleanup. Commissioner Wald stressed the importance of receiving explanatory documents at least a week before the meeting on this item.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel stated that there is a requirement that there be a public process around the use of the Impound Account for Department of Public Works litter collection costs.

12. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

13. **Adjournment.** The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 12, 2011at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee with each set of minutes, or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org.

Approved:

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

OCT 26 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:05 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Excused: Commissioner Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the June 13, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: June 13, 2011 Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald the June 13, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash).

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

4. **Climate Program Update.** Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speaker: Adam Stern, Climate Program Manager (Explanatory Document: Climate Program Presentation to Policy Committee) (Informational Report and Discussion)

   Mr. Stern reported on the Department of the Environment's reorganization to bring together three program areas: climate, renewable energy and green building. He provided an overview of goals, objectives, progress, timelines, and next steps for each (Presentation Slides 2 – 6).

   - Climate: assess progress on 2012 greenhouse gas reduction goals; update Climate Action Plan in consultation with other City agencies and expand web presence; revitalize 2009 Carbon Fund to support new carbon-reduction projects in San Francisco; and initiate adaptation planning with assistance of a consultant, involving key city agencies, and working with the Mayor's Office on developing a scope of work.

   - Renewable Energy: work with Mayor's Renewable Energy Task Force to develop plan for generating 100% of electricity used in San Francisco from renewable sources; launch Solar@Work program enabling small and medium-size businesses to benefit from group solar purchase discounts; streamline the solar permitting process; expand online renewable energy maps; and reduce natural gas use.

   - Green Building: legislation before the Board of Supervisors to require LEED Gold for all municipal projects; work with the Department of Building Inspection to monitor private-sector compliance with green building codes; implement the existing Commercial Building ordinance to benchmark and track energy performance focusing initially on the city's largest buildings; implement Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing for commercial buildings and reestablish residential program; and work with Business Council on Climate Change to distribute a Green Tenant toolkit.

   Commissioner Gravanis inquired about new carbon fund projects being considered and suggested that projects be made available for the America's Cup event so that it can be as carbon-neutral as possible. Mr. Stern reported on three carbon fund projects under review: (1) expand tree planting efforts and improve our urban green park areas to show carbon benefits and improve the environment and quality-of-life for city residents; (2) accelerate the deployment of electric vehicle charging stations; and (3) expand the use of biodiesel especially with City fleets by accelerating the development of the necessary fuel tanks. It is hoped that a strong Carbon Fund program will be in place in time for the America's Cup organizers to consider and serve as an opportunity to build support for carbon-reduction efforts. Director Nutter reported that the America's Cup Organizing Committee committed to offsetting its

travel to Cascais, Portugal for the current round of races through the San Francisco Carbon Fund.

Commissioner Gravanis stated that the America's Cup event provides an opportunity to raise awareness about the San Francisco Bay Delta estuary. A discussion was held about sea-level rise and greenhouse gas emission impacts to our wetlands and shoreline habitat and the importance of providing places for habitats to retreat to. She stated that in addition to tree-planting projects, wetland restoration and other restoration projects be considered as carbon fund projects and suggested consulting with Literacy for Environmental Justice, the Port of San Francisco, and other City agencies toward these efforts.

Commissioner Wald suggested that an effort be made to advise people on opportunities to help realize Climate Action Plan goals. She asked whether there is a way to use people's interest in the America's Cup to encourage participation in the development of the plan or adherence to its goals. Mr. Stern reported that San Francisco's progress toward achieving reduction goals that will soon be shared and validated with other City agencies who will be encouraged to develop new recommendations and strategies for the City to adopt for goals beyond 2012. A completed strategy and updated Climate Action Plan will be available towards the end of the year. Work is currently in progress on how to best present this information on the web for the public to access and act on. The America's Cup event provides an opportunity to fit into this process. Mr. Stern said he expects that San Francisco's progress in reducing GHGs would exceed goals set by the U.N. Kyoto Protocol and California's Assembly Bill 32 (AB32), and that this progress would motivate people to continue San Francisco's leadership in this area.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired about the locations being considered for implementation of district heating. Mr. Stern reported that an opportunity exists at the Transbay Terminal development site. Director Nutter reported that three additional potential sites to evaluate are Treasure Island, Bayview Hunters Point, and the 4th Street Corridor. Commissioner Gravanis suggested holding discussions with developers of Seawall Lot 337 (San Francisco Giants Ballpark A, Mission Rock). Director Nutter reported on a Vancouver policy requiring assessment of district heating and cooling opportunities for all developments that meet certain criteria as a way to accelerate district heating and cooling. Commissioner Wald suggested that more incentives are needed for this program and inquired whether LEED points would be issued.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired about the role that Commissioners can take toward these efforts. Mr. Stern reported that as progress is made in these initiatives, he would like to return to the Commission for their guidance and experience on strategies being considered. Commissioner Wald suggested that the Commission have a more active role as appropriate and possibly be asked to participate in meetings as needed.

Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel suggested that (1) as a way to integrate activities, staff should issue regular reports to the Committee on efforts by other bodies that the Department staffs, e.g., the Urban Forestry Council, Resource Efficiency Building Task Force, and Biodiesel Access Task Force; (2) direct the Climate Action Plan not only to City departments, but to businesses and individuals who also impact results; (3) localize the manufacturing and production of America's Cup souvenirs, manufactured goods, and food products to reduce transportation impacts of offshore products. Commissioner Wald suggested that Mr. Stern develop and encourage partnerships with non-profit and environmental organizations to further program goals.

5. **Commission on the Environment Retreat Follow-up--Evaluation of Retreat and Recommendations for the Future.** The Committee may make recommendations to the full Commission. Sponsors: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis and Director Nutter; Speaker: Director Nutter (Discussion and Possible Action)

Commissioners and Director Nutter discussed the June 9, 2011 retreat topics that focused on the Department's outreach and communication methods to the public in the areas of Commercial and Zero Waste, EnvironmentNow, San Francisco Home Improvement Performance (SFHIP), Toxics Residential Shade Tree Mechanics, and Greening the Dry Cleaning Business. Commissioners relayed the importance of communications metrics and reporting in order to monitor success of Department programs. The agenda topic of reviewing the Commission's accomplishments and policy goals was not heard at that meeting and was continued for discussion.

Commissioners provided their recommendations for future retreat and/or meeting/workshop topics, format, and content. Key points of discussion included:

- The amount of information presented should be structured in a way that Commissioners are better able to express their opinions and provide suggestions, e.g. not too much or too little information.

- The Department has so many programs and projects that the Commission could be apprised of. In an effort to prioritize staff time, differentiate between report formats to the Commission, e.g. written or oral.

- Consider discussing traditional retreat topics such as assessing Commission accomplishments of the past year and plan for future goals. Consider scheduling retreat topics at regular meetings of the Commission.

- Discuss the Commission's and Committee's role in identifying, implementing, and setting policy for inclusion in the Strategic Plan. Review Commission Charter provisions and identify what Commissioners would like to see as Department goals

once resources become available and if not available, establish policies and identify fundraising opportunities.

- Discussion was held on the evolution of the Department from identifying policies and policy setting to management, communications and implementation of policy. How the Commission can play a role in current and future policy making; e.g., America's Cup, Commercial Building Ordinance, Yellow Pages Ordinance, identifying campaigns and policy around consumption and zero waste.

- Consider focused in-depth workshops on particular topics and publicize the agenda to a targeted audience; e.g., environmental organizations that are interested in that topic.

- Create Department programs and discussions around the natural environment.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel expressed his agreement with comments and observations. He suggested that the Committee (1) hold a discussion about establishing a campaign encouraging people to make conscious choices about consumption; (2) identify a roadmap for Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) and zero waste; (3) discuss creating more Department programs around the natural environment; and (4) hold discussions with City agencies on how land management policies relate to environmental values. Commissioner Gravanis suggested formulating collaborative relationships with City agencies around environmental goals and issues such as land management. Commissioner Wald suggested that the InSight campaign interview people about what they think about when they decide to make a purchase.

6. **Update on InSight Campaign.** Sponsor Director Nutter; Speaker: Maggie Weiland, Public Relations and Outreach Assistant

Ms. Weiland, InSight Project Coordinator, reported on the InSight retreat that was held with the Director, the Outreach team, and InSight program staff to discuss the campaign's top priorities and action plan. Main elements of the action plan included (1) continued maintenance and promotion of the campaign within Department staff, other City departments, and the community through the online forum Ideas4SF; (2) a door-hanger project directed to San Francisco residents to engage ideas through another medium other than the internet; and (3) continued community outreach and in-person communication with the public. On-line forum statistics were provided on the number of users and number of ideas generated, and success of the campaign will be quantified using those metrics. She reported on her work managing the forum and reading and delegating ideas to appropriate Department staff in order to formulate concise replies.

Commissioners provided suggestions on the online forum as follows:

- Manage expectations. Provide users with instructions on how to use the online forum, if and when a response will be issued. Provide quality assurance of responses by managing or cross-referencing duplicates.

- Provide direction on the forum about what the Department plans to do with the ideas provided, whether responses will be shared with other agencies, and when appropriate, refer people to the appropriate agency. Inform participants how many votes total they would be allowed to make; how many different ideas they would be allowed to vote for.

- Share comments and work with other City agencies on formulating responses.

- Structure the website in a way to provide regular updates and gage progress on ideas.

Director Nutter reported that the objective of the campaign is for the Department of the Environment to facilitate and create a forum for the community to share their sustainability ideas, and ideas will be responded to whenever possible. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that this information be added to the online forum in order to manage expectations. Ms. Weiland stated that another objective of the forum is to generate topics around innovative ideas and connect users back to existing programs.

Ms. Weiland discussed the door hanger project that will serve as an opportunity to generate interest and attain a wide scope of feedback. It will help reach out to individuals who do not use the internet, underserved neighborhoods, increase participation in programs, and increase the number of people on mailing lists and newsletters. Commissioner Gravanis discussed safety and security concerns of door hangers and asked that training be provided to ensure that door hangers are not placed on residences that have "Post No Bills" signs. Commissioner Wald stated that it is important to tell people what will be done with the information provided and to integrate the number of door-hanger responses into the website. She suggested adding InSight campaign information to water bill or Recology bill inserts as an alternative.

Ms. Weiland discussed the in-person communication campaign to generate interest and participation in Department programs. She reported that she along with four staff/interns attended thirty community events in the past two-and-a-half months, conducting 500 surveys asking the same questions that the online forum asks. Success of this campaign is being quantified, and more community outreach is planned.

Director Nutter discussed plans to engage the new Mayor's administration in this campaign by relaying top ideas, holding an event with the new Mayor and the community on plans for ideas; and working with the Mayor to adopt and implement ideas. Commissioner Gravanis cautioned against making any suggestion that the number of votes an item got should indicate the value of that idea. Commissioner Wald suggested that Department staff provide the Mayor with an expert opinion on ideas and show the level of community support as well as a roadmap for implementation.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel stated that (1) he appreciates the door hanger and web campaign, and that it would be interesting to compare response rates from different communication channels to different communities; (2) spoke in support of the handout developed for the Earth Day breakfast that has information on all of the Department's programs and suggested adding the Ideas4SF campaign to that handout and distributing it at all events that staff attends; (3) discussed the Public Library's referral to the Department as part of the BagIt film as an effective overall communication strategy that other City departments should engage in; and (4) reported that Mr. Westlund, Program Outreach Manager, is leaving the Department to work at the Sierra Club as the Deputy National Communications Director and asked that the Department review its outreach organizational structure.

Agenda Items 7 – 9 were continued to the September 12, 2011 meeting.

7. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Continued from the June 13, 2011 Meeting) Sponsors: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis (Explanatory Document: Memo to Policy Committee and Commission Outreach Draft List) (Informational Report and Discussion). Continued to the September 12, 2011 meeting.

8. **Purposes of Commission Outreach List and Criteria for Inclusion.** Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speakers: Commissioner Gravanis and Director Nutter (Discussion). Continued to the September 12, 2011 meeting.

9. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion) Continued to the September 12, 2011 meeting.

10. **Announcements.** (Discussion) This agenda item was not heard at this time.

11. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion) Agenda items discussed for the September 12 meeting included the Outreach List discussion; Committee review of the America's Cup Sustainability Draft Plan if complete; and Commissioner Gravanis will speak on biodiversity. Director Nutter reported that the Zero Waste team has asked that the Committee hold a discussion on the use of Impound Account funds for litter

cleanup. Commissioner Wald stressed the importance of receiving explanatory documents at least a week before the meeting on this item.

Public Comment: Mr. Pilpel stated that there is a requirement that there be a public process around the use of the Impound Account for Department of Public Works litter collection costs.

12. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

13. **Adjournment.** The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 12, 2011at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee with each set of minutes, or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org.

Approved: October 24, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.
A Department of the City and County of San Francisco

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

Melanie Nutter
Director

3.71

12/11
cancelled

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

NOTICE OF CANCELLED MEETING
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2011, 5:00 p.m.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

08-31-11A10:31 RCVD

The Monday, September 12, 2011, 5:00 p.m. meeting of the Commission on the Environment's Policy Committee has been CANCELLED due to a lack of quorum. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 24, 2011, at 5:00 p.m. at City Hall, Room 421. Please contact Commission Secretary, Monica Fish, at 415-355-3709 or Monica.Fish@sfgov.org if you would like to be placed on the agenda mailing list for future meetings. An agenda may also be accessed on the Commission website at https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee.

~~08-31-2R21-029CEDL~~

Posted: August 31, 2011

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

AUG 31 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

10-18-11P04:08 RCVD

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

OCT 18 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

3.71

12/4/11

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING AND AGENDA
MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS
Public comment will be taken before the Committee takes action on any item.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.**
2. **Approval of Minutes of the August 8, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: August 8, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)
3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
4. **Approval of the 2010 San Francisco Buy Green Program for City Staff Annual Report for recommendation to the Commission on the Environment.** (Explanatory Document: 2010 Buy Green Annual Report) Sponsor Melanie Nutter, Director; Speakers: Chris Geiger, Green Purchasing Manager and Jessian Choy, City Toxics Reduction Assistant (Presentation Time: 15 minutes) (Discussion and Action)
5. **Local Opportunities to Drive Product Stewardship.** (Explanatory Document: California Product Stewardship Council: A Better Way: Product Stewardship) Speakers: Sushma Bhatia, Toxics Reduction Program Manager and David Assmann, Deputy Director (Presentation Time: 20 minutes) (Informational Report and Discussion)
6. **Approval of a Resolution adopting as Commission policy an acknowledgement of the importance of protecting, restoring and enhancing San Francisco's indigenous biodiversity, and encouraging development staff to seek funding for biodiversity staffing and programs for recommendation to the Commission.** (Explanatory Document: Draft Resolution and Background) Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speakers: Commissioner Gravanis and David Assmann, Deputy Director. (Total Presentation Time: 10 minutes) (Discussion and Action)

7. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Explanatory Document: Outreach List) (Continued from the August 8, 2011 Meeting) Sponsors: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis (5 minutes) (Informational Report, Discussion and Action)
8. **Purposes of Commission Outreach List and Criteria for Inclusion.** (Continued from the August 8, 2011 Meeting) Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speakers: Commissioner Gravanis and Director Nutter (5 minutes) (Discussion and Action)
9. **Committee Suggestions for the Commission on the Environment 2011 Annual Report Content.** (Explanatory Document: Commission 2011 Annual Report Draft) (10 minutes) (Discussion)
10. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)
11. **Announcements.** (Discussion)
12. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)
13. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
14. **Adjournment.**

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 14, 201, 5:00 p.m., in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee , or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org within three business days of a meeting. If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Commission Policy Committee after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Department of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 during normal office hours or will be made available at the Policy Committee meeting website link https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee as attachments included with the agenda or meeting minutes.

Important Information

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the Committee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Committee members. Any written comments should be sent to: Commission Secretary of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Comments which cannot be delivered to the Commission Secretary by that time may be taken directly to the hearing at the location above. When bringing handouts to meetings,

please photocopy on both sides of the paper and try to use post-consumer recycled or tree-free paper. Also, please bring sufficient copies of handouts for the Committee, the Commission Secretary and the public.

Public Comment

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but are not on today's agenda. Public comment will be taken following each agendized item. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes, unless otherwise announced by the Chair. If it is demonstrated that the comments by the public will exceed 15 minutes, the Chair may continue Public Comment to another time during the meeting.

The Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue not appearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In response to public comment, not on an agendized item, the Committee is limited to:

1. Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
2. Request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
3. Directing staff to place the item or issue on a future agenda (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Disability Access

The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meeting will be held at City Hall, Room 421, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, in the Civic Center area. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the Civic Center Station at United Nations Plaza and Market Street. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro Stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For information about MUNI accessible services call (415) 923-6142. There is accessible curbside parking adjacent to City Hall on Grove Street and Van Ness Avenue and in the vicinity of the Veterans Building at 401 Van Ness Avenue adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Monica Fish at (415) 355-3709 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call the Mayor's Office on Disability at (415) 554-6789 or (415) 554-6799 (TTY) for further information.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance
(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Sunshine Task Force Administrator, City Hall, Room 409, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683 at Phone No.: (415) 554-7724; Fax No.: (415) 554-7854; E-mail sotf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3112; web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Posted: October 18, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING DRAFT MINUTES
MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

3.71
2
12/4/11
draft

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

NOV - 4 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting convened at 6:03 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Excused: Commissioner Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the August 8, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: August 8, 2011 Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the August 8, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved (AYES: Commissioners Gravanis and Wald; Absent: Commissioner Prakash). Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel asked that in the future, the first reference to his public comment include his first name.

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.

   Ms. Lauren Smith, Environmental Studies student, San Francisco State University, addressed the Committee in the areas of recycling and toxics reduction. She proposed that Recology distribute to the public a separate bin with four different sections to hold non-recyclable and toxic material, e.g., paint, motor oil, lightbulbs, batteries, and electronics that would be picked up and replaced with an empty bin at time of pickup. This system incorporated into the normal waste management program would make it easier to recycle this type of material and ensure proper disposal without having to make special pick- up arrangements. She stated

that this proposal would also help reach the City reach its' zero waste goals by 2020 and meet Sustainability Plan report card and Strategic Plan goals.

Ms. Lauren Spalter, San Francisco State University student, proposed (1) that San Francisco considers a bottle-labeling and machine-recycling program as one she has seen in Germany. As soon as you are done with the beverage, it is recycled in the machine that is located in every store and shopping center, and tax money is received back on the bottle; (2) sending a letter to bottled water companies to influence them to use glass bottles. She commended the efforts she has seen in San Francisco and Germany, and suggested influencing every-day Americans to green the city and return to nature.

Mr. David Pilpel suggested that students with the assistance of Department of the Environment staff write a story in San Francisco State University's newspaper, the Golden Gate Xpress, about what students should do in the areas of recycling and toxics reduction.

Ms. Lurilla Harris discussed the inattention of university students to instructions on how to recycle and compost in the cafeteria bins.

Ms. Alicia Torres, journalist student, San Francisco State University, stated that she is writing a blog about green business in San Francisco and has written about subjects such as lightbulbs and energy efficiency, solar panels, and the Tenderloin neighborhood gardening project. She stated that she would bring back suggestions that are made to the editors and thanked the Department and Commission for helping the city be green through its support and regulation.

Deputy Director Assmann suggested that students access the Department of the Environment's Community InSight's website as a way to add their ideas and receive feedback. He commended the students for researching the Sustainability and Strategic Plans as a basis for their ideas.

4. **Approval of the 2010 San Francisco Buy Green Program for City Staff Annual Report for recommendation to the Commission on the Environment.** (Explanatory Documents: 2010 Buy Green Annual Report and Presentation) Sponsor Melanie Nutter, Director; Speakers: Chris Geiger, Green Purchasing Manager and Jessian Choy, City Toxics Reduction Assistant (Presentation Time: 15 minutes) (Discussion and Action)

Ms. Jessian Choy recognized Dr. Chris Geiger and Ms. Julie Bryant for their contribution to the Buy Green Program for City Staff Annual Report. Topics of discussion included:

- Strategies to influence behavior change amongst City staff to buy green products through consultations, information-sharing, and incentives.
- The increase and decrease of green product purchases in 2010.
- Personal health benefits of buying green and harmful chemicals in the blood-stream that may result from the purchase of non-green products.
- Creation of (1) a new website SFApproved.org http://www.sfapproved.org/ that lists best green purchasing information; (2) a new report listing names of who purchased green and prohibitive products for the purpose of accountability, gathering information, conducting research and offering incentives; (3) a "Buy Green Scorecard" that gives Department points for buying more than 75 percent of green products, attending a consultation, and acting as department green leaders.

- The San Francisco Public Library received the "Buy Club Green of the Year Award". The Department's Climate Team was thanked for influencing staff to fill out their scorecards.
- Departments spent $500,000 out of $7 million in 2010 on prohibitive and limited use products.

Ms. Choy discussed strategies that are being considered: (1) Department of Human Resources to provide City departments with an option to add a buy green category to performance appraisal forms so staff can be motivated to buy green and receive recognition; (2) to change the purchasing process so that vendors offer online customized catalogs of allowed purchases; and (3) revamp the City purchasing software.

Commissioner Wald suggested finding a way to make the purchasing process easier for people to buy approved items and difficult to buy unapproved items so it will encourage the purchase of approved products. Ms. Choy reported that the Department of Technology has done so with LEED Gold computer purchases. Dr. Geiger reported that the Office Supplies Contract and online system is filtered for approved and prohibitive products, but there are challenges with other contracts. He explained that the entire City purchasing system has to be replaced, but that it is expensive and is not possible during this budgetary time.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired about the role of the City Purchaser in City department ordering. Ms. Choy explained that departments have discretion for purchases of up to $10,000 and are required to purchase from City contracts for anything above $10,000. Each department has their own process for purchasing. Some may have green leaders that advocate for green purchases. Deputy Director Assmann reported that City departments are required to purchase from City-approved vendors, but they do not have to go through Centralized Purchasing. The current budget has forced the Controller's Office to give departments more discretion in purchasing than in the past, so now the Department of the Environment has to work with individual departments to make sure they are doing the right thing.

Commissioner Wald suggested working with the Controller's Office to implement a different approach such as institutionalizing on the internet the limits, criteria, and products that were previously agreed to. She suggested identifying and working on the worst problem areas by volume first and developing a system for the City to use. Deputy Director Assmann reported that could be accomplished through an Executive Order or Board of Supervisors Ordinance to restrict or setup new procedures for purchasing of certain items. Dr. Geiger explained that the current purchasing system cannot easily track purchases so purchases are not necessarily being filtered.

Commissioner Wald suggested working with approved vendors to agree to sell only the approved products on the list. If the product is not on the list, the purchaser would have to call for approval. Deputy Director Assmann reported that there is a stringent system for becoming a City vendor and is one area that could be worked on. Dr. Geiger reported that contract language is added whenever possible. Ms. Bhatia suggested targeting approved vendors. Ms. Choy suggested reviewing the past record of vendor sales before reapproving their City-approved vendor status. Deputy Director Assmann reported that it is a requirement that vendors who sell over a certain quantity or dollar amount report annually on prohibitive products. Dr. Geiger reported that vendors are now required to report on all sales in green

contracts, but not other contracts. He concurred that vendors should report on sales of prohibitive products and would review the list of products that are not being covered.

Commissioner Gravanis commended the approach that is being taken to establish collaborative relationships with City departments and the progress that has been made. She suggested that discussions be held with the Recreation and Park Department on selection of toilet paper dispensers in their facilities as the current ones create a lot of waste. Dr. Geiger reported that he and Ms. Bryant are working with Recreation and Park Department staff on selection of different products and to switch over to electric hand-dryers.

Commissioner Gravanis suggested that there be a follow-up with departments to make sure that they are recycling and composting products and recharging batteries they are purchasing. She suggested that Zero Waste staff present at a future Committee meeting on how their efforts correspond with purchasing efforts. Ms. Choy reported that she often meets with departments and discusses incentives for purchasing rechargeable batteries, asks how often batteries are being recharged, and makes them aware of the availability of a new hybrid rechargeable battery that can last up to one year. Dr. Geiger discussed infrastructure obstacles that some departments face with rechargeable batteries. Ms. Choy discussed her work making it easier for City gardeners who don't have recycling and composting bins readily available. Dr. Geiger reported that the Zero Waste team is working with hospitals on recycling and composting of disposable food-ware.

Commissioner Wald commended Ms. Choy and Dr. Geiger's strategies to influence behavior change and presentation. She asked that an effort be made to share these strategies with other Department staff so they can take advantage of them. Deputy Director Assmann reported that he would consider adding the buy green category to the Department's appraisal form.

Public Comment:

Ms. Rebecca Evans, former Commissioner, inquired whether (1) non-rechargeable batteries are being properly recycled and (2) why departments would purchase a product if it was prohibitive. Ms. Choy reported that departments receive points for having battery recycling bins. These bins contain instructions on who to call to pick bins up. Meetings are held with departments to make them aware of enforcement and fines. Ms. Choy reported that non-green products may be purchased because departments may not be able to change out fixtures to accommodate certain products.

Ms. Alicia Torres discussed the availability of LED lanterns and flashlights and suggested that employees consider buying their own hand-cranked radio, LED lanterns and flashlights to cut down on general office equipment costs and the purchase of non-green products.

Mr. David Pilpel suggested (1) that this is an opportune time to contact the City Purchaser to revamp the purchasing system; (2) include a story that sets an example of how a City department changed its practice and benefits that resulted; and (3) influence City staff to visit and purchase products from Building Resources.

Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the 2010 Buy Green Program for City Staff Annual Report was approved for recommendation to the Commission

for placement on the consent calendar upon approval by the Commission President. (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash)

5. **Local Opportunities to Drive Product Stewardship.** (Explanatory Document: California Product Stewardship Council: A Better Way: Product Stewardship and Presentation) Speakers: Sushma Bhatia, Toxics Reduction Program Manager and David Assmann, Deputy Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

Deputy Director Assmann reported on discussions held at the last Rate Board Review meeting about the appropriateness of using garbage rates and other City funds to pay for litter costs and other options to pay for these costs. He discussed the large expense that the Department of Public Works incurs to pay for litter cleanup. A cigarette litter fee was approved through the legislative process that put a twenty-cent fee on every pack of cigarettes sold in the city to cover a portion of litter removal costs. The City was sued for that fee and recently won the lawsuit. Unless it is appealed, it is legal to charge the fee and use the fee money to cover some of the cost of litter removal in the city. Litter studies have shown that the number one item in the litter stream are cigarette butts, and the fee charged was proportional to the percentage of cigarette butts in the litter stream.

Deputy Director Assmann reported that because of a redefinition of fees at the state level through the initiative process, this same model cannot be applied to other elements of litter, and a voter-approval process would be required. As a result, the avenue of revenue to cover Department of Public Works costs has been shut off. Part of the rate review process is to review all City services for illegal dumping, litter, and toxic materials and determine who or what to charge to cover the cost for removal, e.g. the General Fund, people who created the problem, or people who produced the products in an unsustainable way. Local governments joined together to form the California Product Stewardship Council, which looks at a different way of managing products through a cradle to cradle system that is dependent on a producer or product manufacturer collecting material and making it into something else. He reported that consumer products are now an enormous part of the waste stream and product waste is skyrocketing as a result.

Ms. Sushma Bhatia discussed the concept of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) or Product Stewardship, which is requiring manufacturers to share in the responsibility of recycling or disposing the product at the end of its life. She discussed why it is important, what has been done around the state to advocate for EPR initiatives, and where the City can take a leadership role to promote EPR at the local level. Topics of discussion included:

- The increase of product waste since 1960. (Slide 2)
- Change in the nature of products in the waste stream that contain toxic components and/or are single-use. (Slide 3)
- Producer Responsibility Definition. (Slide 4)
- Flow Chart of current and proposed system. (Slide 5)
- Voluntary and Mandatory Product Responsibility models to take back products. (Slides 6-7)
- State of EPR adoption in California for toxic products only. (Slide 8)
- Local Producer Responsibility Efforts. (Slide 9)
- Drug Take Back Program. (Slide 10)
- Local Collection of Hazardous Waste. (Slide 11)
- Local Priorities and Barriers to Producer Responsibility. (Slides 12-13)

Commissioner Gravanis reported that the Drug Enforcement Administration was sponsoring a "Drug Take Back Day" on October 29 and inquired about the amount of publicity for this program. Ms. Bhatia reported that "Drug Take Back Day" is being promoted and is a voluntary program sponsored in conjunction with state and local law enforcement for collection of controlled and non-controlled substances. The Drug Take Back pilot collection program will only be for non-controlled substances to be collected at some, but not all pharmacies, and may not be convenient for everyone. Deputy Director Assmann stated that consumers do not distinguish between controlled and non-controlled substances, and to have a more robust program, federal regulations would have to be changed in order to set up collection for both at pharmacies.

Commissioner Wald inquired about costs that are associated with these programs. Ms. Bhatia stated that consumers ultimately pay through taxes or garbage funds for disposal of the product, or the producer that collects the product will collect costs through an increase in the cost of the product. Deputy Director Assmann stated that the idea of EPR is to make it as efficient and low-cost as possible and would cost less than local government programs. Mr. Kevin Drew, Department of the Environment Zero Waste program staff, discussed the possibility of adding a fee or deposit to the sale of alkaline batteries in order to pay for recycling costs. A discussion was held on successful battery recycling programs that have been recently implemented, e.g. battery recycling collection buckets in apartment buildings and curbside collection.

Public Comment:

Ms. Lurilla Harris inquired about the disposition of the drugs that are turned in at collection sites. Ms. Bhatia reported that almost all medications are incinerated. Ms. Harris asked if incinerating the drugs would release toxins in the air. Ms. Bhatia stated that there are different types of landfills and incinerators that can be used to capture the dangerous chemicals.

Ms. Rebecca Evans inquired about the source of sharps and why they are considered contaminants. Ms. Bhatia explained that sharps are used to administer insulin and discussed safety concerns in the case when medicine is left in the sharp and improperly disposed of. A discussion was held about proper collection methods for sharps.

Mr. David Pilpel stated that EPR should be thought about in a more holistic way than just zero waste and toxics reduction. He suggested implementing "buy less" and "unburden your-self of your stuff" neighborhood campaigns through the integration of existing programs such as EnvironmentNow and Gigantic 3. Mr. Pilpel suggested that designated people be sent to people's homes and work with social service agencies to assist with campaigns and integrate strategies. Ms. Evans stated that outreach methods don't always reach tenants and discussed the amount of people with similar issues. Mr. Drew stated this topic involves consumer responsibility.

A discussion was held on next steps. Deputy Director Assmann stated that he would research whether adding a deposit on batteries is a legal option. He discussed analyses that could be implemented of how many batteries are sold in San Francisco, what other products are being collected, and what percentage of what products are being distributed. California sales figures could also be reviewed. Commissioner Wald suggested adding a point-of-sale fee on

alkaline batteries as a local ballot measure that could then be brought to the state level. Mr. Pilpel suggested putting informational signs (similar to the Cell Phone Ordinance sign approach) to educate the public about the disposal and feasibility of purchasing alkaline batteries as opposed to rechargeable battery alternatives. He suggested that the Department and Committee work on a Proposition 26 proposal to recommend to the Commission. Mr. Drew discussed Ontario, Canada's product stewardship efforts and discussions about implementing product bans. This agenda topic would be brought back to the Commission at a future date.

6. **Approval of a Resolution adopting as Commission policy an acknowledgement of the importance of protecting, restoring and enhancing San Francisco's indigenous biodiversity, and encouraging development staff to seek funding for biodiversity staffing and programs for recommendation to the Commission.** (Explanatory Document: Draft Resolution and Background) Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speakers: Commissioner Gravanis and David Assmann, Deputy Director. (Discussion and Action)

Commissioner Gravanis reported on the need for the Commission and the Department of the Environment to develop a biodiversity policy framework for restoring and protecting San Francisco's biodiversity. She explained that biodiversity is not only ecological restoration but includes protection of wildlife throughout the City, by means such as avoiding light pollution, designing building facades so as not to impair migratory birds, and regulating pesticides.

Commissioner Gravanis reported that the reason this effort has not been pursued before now is because of a lack of funding and resources. The Department's activities are funded by grants and contracts, and specific sources of funding are directed to specific projects. She suggested that development staff prioritize fundraising to employ staff with expertise in this area to launch programs and develop a plan for biological biodiversity. Activities that are currently taking place without funding include development of material to place on the Department's website and adding brochures about nature in the city to Eco Center shelf space.

Public Comment:

Ms. Rebecca Evans, on behalf of the Sierra Club, spoke in support of the Resolution and biodiversity policy. She agreed with the background document that states that not all invasive species are bad and stated that when looking at restoration or protection of resources, it is important to look at plants that may exist for the feeding of specific critters. Ms. Evans stated that she has seen a lot of degradation of resources in San Francisco, and supports a biodiversity policy.

Mr. David Pilpel agreed that the Commission on the Environment should not only be about the urban and built environment, but about the natural environment. He stated that an initial step is to have Department staff available to understand, comment and inform discussions. He pointed out that there are existing Department programs such as urban forestry and agriculture that could be integrated into this effort.

Mr. Damien Raffa, educator, spoke in the support of the Resolution and Biodiversity policy. He stated that this policy be in the portfolio of concerns for the Department of the Environment because of the relationship between the environment and protecting biodiversity on the

planet. A direct relationship to real nature is essential to make all environmental policies relevant, and it is important to protect the natural heritage and biological diversity that still exists in San Francisco. Mr. Raffa reported that he would gather support for this topic at the full Commission meeting on November 22, 2011 during public comment. Commissioner Gravanis discussed the potential concerns and misconceptions that have been expressed about this agenda topic.

Commissioner Wald motioned to recommend the Resolution with un-substantive word changes to the Commission's Consent Agenda. A discussion ensued about consent agenda procedures and the ability to have public comment in support of the Resolution. Commissioner Wald amended her original motion and motioned to approve the Resolution for recommendation to the Commission for its regular calendar, second by Commissioner Gravanis. (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash)

Items 7 and 8 were heard together.

7. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Explanatory Document: Outreach List) (Continued from the August 8, 2011 Meeting) Sponsors: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis (Informational Report, Discussion and Action)
8. **Purposes of Commission Outreach List and Criteria for Inclusion.** (Continued from the August 8, 2011 Meeting) Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speakers: Commissioner Gravanis and Director Nutter (Discussion and Action)

Commissioner Gravanis discussed the history of the outreach effort and outcome of the survey to environmental organizations that was sent in order to influence more active engagement between the Commission and environmental groups on activities and policy issues. She suggested revisiting the survey and responses to see if this process was an effective vehicle for accomplishing this effort.

Discussions were held on next steps to (1) revise the survey; (2) potentially employ volunteer staff to verify the accuracy of the expanded list of organizations and contacts; (3) access the Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services (MONS) list of environmental organizations once it has been established; (4) verify that the survey was sent to the Commission agenda mailing list and (5) review the list that received the original survey, verify it was sent to the right people, and then follow-up on the responses to the survey.

Commissioner Wald proposed not expanding the current list at this time because of work by the Mayor's Office and overlap with the Community InSight project. She suggested focusing on the current Commission agenda mailing list and verifying that the right people from those organizations are receiving notices. Commissioner Wald suggested revisiting this issue at a future date to determine what impact the InSight project is having on public participation and the status of the Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services effort. Commissioner Wald suggested working with people who are involved in the America's Cup in the dialogue about what key issues the City should be working with others on. Commissioner Gravanis suggested also working with people who are involved in the Precautionary Principle.

Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel suggested sending a survey to the current Commission agenda mailing list asking to verify the contact person and whether there are other things that the Department, Commission and its Committees should be doing given their work in policy and oversight. He suggested that the Director and Deputy Director consider convening

periodic meetings of some number of organizations discussing both the organizations' and Department's activities and identifying what partnerships can be formed.

Deputy Director Assmann stated that this effort should be spearheaded by the Department's Outreach staff once the Project Manager and new staff members are on board. This agenda item was continued to the November 14, 2011 meeting to discuss next steps.

9. **Committee Suggestions for the Commission on the Environment 2011 Annual Report Content.** (Explanatory Document: Commission 2011 Annual Report Draft) (Discussion) Commissioner Wald asked that last week's carbon milestone and the Community InSight project topics be added to the 2011 Report. This agenda topic was continued to the November 14, 2011 meeting.

10. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Deputy Director Assmann for Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion) Deputy Director Assmann reported that there would be a hearing on October 25 from 5:30 – 7:00 p.m. at Pier 1 to share comments on the Draft America's Cup Sustainability Plan.

11. **Announcements.** (Discussion) There were no announcements made at this time.

12. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion) Commissioner Wald suggested that the November 14, 2011 meeting agenda include review of the Commission's 2011 Draft Annual Report and Commission Outreach discussion led by Deputy Director Assmann. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that the November 14 meeting include a discussion on the Balloon Release Ordinance.

    Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel inquired suggested additional discussion on Extended Producer Responsibility at the next meeting.

13. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

14. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393
The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 14, 2011at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.
** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee with each set of minutes, or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org.

Approved:

SF *Environment*
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

11-16-11P12:10 RCVD

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

NOV 16 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

3.71
2
12/4/11
Approved

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING APPROVED MINUTES
MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting convened at 6:03 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Excused: Commissioner Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the August 8, 2011 Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: August 8, 2011 Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the August 8, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved (AYES: Commissioners Gravanis and Wald; Absent: Commissioner Prakash). Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel asked that in the future, the first reference to his public comment include his first name.

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.

   Ms. Lauren Smith, Environmental Studies student, San Francisco State University, addressed the Committee in the areas of recycling and toxics reduction. She proposed that Recology distribute to the public a separate bin with four different sections to hold non-recyclable and toxic material, e.g., paint, motor oil, lightbulbs, batteries, and electronics that would be picked up and replaced with an empty bin at time of pickup. This system incorporated into the normal waste management program would make it easier to recycle this type of material and ensure proper disposal without having to make special pick- up arrangements. She stated

that this proposal would also help reach the City reach its' zero waste goals by 2020 and meet Sustainability Plan report card and Strategic Plan goals.

Ms. Lauren Spalter, San Francisco State University student, proposed (1) that San Francisco considers a bottle-labeling and machine-recycling program as one she has seen in Germany. As soon as you are done with the beverage, it is recycled in the machine that is located in every store and shopping center, and tax money is received back on the bottle; (2) sending a letter to bottled water companies to influence them to use glass bottles. She commended the efforts she has seen in San Francisco and Germany, and suggested influencing every-day Americans to green the city and return to nature.

Mr. David Pilpel suggested that students with the assistance of Department of the Environment staff write a story in San Francisco State University's newspaper, the Golden Gate Xpress, about what students should do in the areas of recycling and toxics reduction.

Ms. Lurilla Harris discussed the inattention of university students to instructions on how to recycle and compost in the cafeteria bins.

Ms. Alicia Torres, journalist student, San Francisco State University, stated that she is writing a blog about green business in San Francisco and has written about subjects such as lightbulbs and energy efficiency, solar panels, and the Tenderloin neighborhood gardening project. She stated that she would bring back suggestions that are made to the editors and thanked the Department and Commission for helping the city be green through its support and regulation.

Deputy Director Assmann suggested that students access the Department of the Environment's Community InSight's website as a way to add their ideas and receive feedback. He commended the students for researching the Sustainability and Strategic Plans as a basis for their ideas.

4. **Approval of the 2010 San Francisco Buy Green Program for City Staff Annual Report for recommendation to the Commission on the Environment.** (Explanatory Documents: 2010 Buy Green Annual Report and Presentation) Sponsor Melanie Nutter, Director; Speakers: Chris Geiger, Green Purchasing Manager and Jessian Choy, City Toxics Reduction Assistant (Presentation Time: 15 minutes) (Discussion and Action)

Ms. Jessian Choy recognized Dr. Chris Geiger and Ms. Julie Bryant for their contribution to the Buy Green Program for City Staff Annual Report. Topics of discussion included:

- Strategies to influence behavior change amongst City staff to buy green products through consultations, information-sharing, and incentives.
- The increase and decrease of green product purchases in 2010.
- Personal health benefits of buying green and harmful chemicals in the blood-stream that may result from the purchase of non-green products.
- Creation of (1) a new website SFApproved.org http://www.sfapproved.org/ that lists best green purchasing information; (2) a new report listing names of who purchased green and prohibitive products for the purpose of accountability, gathering information, conducting research and offering incentives; (3) a "Buy Green Scorecard" that gives Department points for buying more than 75 percent of green products, attending a consultation, and acting as department green leaders.

- The San Francisco Public Library received the "Buy Club Green of the Year Award". The Department's Climate Team was thanked for influencing staff to fill out their scorecards.
- Departments spent $500,000 out of $7 million in 2010 on prohibitive and limited use products.

Ms. Choy discussed strategies that are being considered: (1) Department of Human Resources to provide City departments with an option to add a buy green category to performance appraisal forms so staff can be motivated to buy green and receive recognition; (2) to change the purchasing process so that vendors offer online customized catalogs of allowed purchases; and (3) revamp the City purchasing software.

Commissioner Wald suggested finding a way to make the purchasing process easier for people to buy approved items and difficult to buy unapproved items so it will encourage the purchase of approved products. Ms. Choy reported that the Department of Technology has done so with LEED Gold computer purchases. Dr. Geiger reported that the Office Supplies Contract and online system is filtered for approved and prohibitive products, but there are challenges with other contracts. He explained that the entire City purchasing system has to be replaced, but that it is expensive and is not possible during this budgetary time.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired about the role of the City Purchaser in City department ordering. Ms. Choy explained that departments have discretion for purchases of up to $10,000 and are required to purchase from City contracts for anything above $10,000. Each department has their own process for purchasing. Some may have green leaders that advocate for green purchases. Deputy Director Assmann reported that City departments are required to purchase from City-approved vendors, but they do not have to go through Centralized Purchasing. The current budget has forced the Controller's Office to give departments more discretion in purchasing than in the past, so now the Department of the Environment has to work with individual departments to make sure they are doing the right thing.

Commissioner Wald suggested working with the Controller's Office to implement a different approach such as institutionalizing on the internet the limits, criteria, and products that were previously agreed to. She suggested identifying and working on the worst problem areas by volume first and developing a system for the City to use. Deputy Director Assmann reported that could be accomplished through an Executive Order or Board of Supervisors Ordinance to restrict or setup new procedures for purchasing of certain items. Dr. Geiger explained that the current purchasing system cannot easily track purchases so purchases are not necessarily being filtered.

Commissioner Wald suggested working with approved vendors to agree to sell only the approved products on the list. If the product is not on the list, the purchaser would have to call for approval. Deputy Director Assmann reported that there is a stringent system for becoming a City vendor and is one area that could be worked on. Dr. Geiger reported that contract language is added whenever possible. Ms. Bhatia suggested targeting approved vendors. Ms. Choy suggested reviewing the past record of vendor sales before reapproving their City-approved vendor status. Deputy Director Assmann reported that it is a requirement that vendors who sell over a certain quantity or dollar amount report annually on prohibitive products. Dr. Geiger reported that vendors are now required to report on all sales in green

contracts, but not other contracts. He concurred that vendors should report on sales of prohibitive products and would review the list of products that are not being covered.

Commissioner Gravanis commended the approach that is being taken to establish collaborative relationships with City departments and the progress that has been made. She suggested that discussions be held with the Recreation and Park Department on selection of toilet paper dispensers in their facilities as the current ones create a lot of waste. Dr. Geiger reported that he and Ms. Bryant are working with Recreation and Park Department staff on selection of different products and to switch over to electric hand-dryers.

Commissioner Gravanis suggested that there be a follow-up with departments to make sure that they are recycling and composting products and recharging batteries they are purchasing. She suggested that Zero Waste staff present at a future Committee meeting on how their efforts correspond with purchasing efforts. Ms. Choy reported that she often meets with departments and discusses incentives for purchasing rechargeable batteries, asks how often batteries are being recharged, and makes them aware of the availability of a new hybrid rechargeable battery that can last up to one year. Dr. Geiger discussed infrastructure obstacles that some departments face with rechargeable batteries. Ms. Choy discussed her work making it easier for City gardeners who don't have recycling and composting bins readily available. Dr. Geiger reported that the Zero Waste team is working with hospitals on recycling and composting of disposable food-ware.

Commissioner Wald commended Ms. Choy and Dr. Geiger's strategies to influence behavior change and presentation. She asked that an effort be made to share these strategies with other Department staff so they can take advantage of them. Deputy Director Assmann reported that he would consider adding the buy green category to the Department's appraisal form.

Public Comment:

Ms. Rebecca Evans, former Commissioner, inquired whether (1) non-rechargeable batteries are being properly recycled and (2) why departments would purchase a product if it was prohibitive. Ms. Choy reported that departments receive points for having battery recycling bins. These bins contain instructions on who to call to pick bins up. Meetings are held with departments to make them aware of enforcement and fines. Ms. Choy reported that non-green products may be purchased because departments may not be able to change out fixtures to accommodate certain products.

Ms. Alicia Torres discussed the availability of LED lanterns and flashlights and suggested that employees consider buying their own hand-cranked radio, LED lanterns and flashlights to cut down on general office equipment costs and the purchase of non-green products.

Mr. David Pilpel suggested (1) that this is an opportune time to contact the City Purchaser to revamp the purchasing system; (2) include a story that sets an example of how a City department changed its practice and benefits that resulted; and (3) influence City staff to visit and purchase products from Building Resources.

Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the 2010 Buy Green Program for City Staff Annual Report was approved for recommendation to the Commission

for placement on the consent calendar upon approval by the Commission President. (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash)

5. **Local Opportunities to Drive Product Stewardship.** (Explanatory Document: California Product Stewardship Council: A Better Way: Product Stewardship and Presentation) Speakers: Sushma Bhatia, Toxics Reduction Program Manager and David Assmann, Deputy Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

Deputy Director Assmann reported on discussions held at the last Rate Board Review meeting about the appropriateness of using garbage rates and other City funds to pay for litter costs and other options to pay for these costs. He discussed the large expense that the Department of Public Works incurs to pay for litter cleanup. A cigarette litter fee was approved through the legislative process that put a twenty-cent fee on every pack of cigarettes sold in the city to cover a portion of litter removal costs. The City was sued for that fee and recently won the lawsuit. Unless it is appealed, it is legal to charge the fee and use the fee money to cover some of the cost of litter removal in the city. Litter studies have shown that the number one item in the litter stream are cigarette butts, and the fee charged was proportional to the percentage of cigarette butts in the litter stream.

Deputy Director Assmann reported that because of a redefinition of fees at the state level through the initiative process, this same model cannot be applied to other elements of litter, and a voter-approval process would be required. As a result, the avenue of revenue to cover Department of Public Works costs has been shut off. Part of the rate review process is to review all City services for illegal dumping, litter, and toxic materials and determine who or what to charge to cover the cost for removal, e.g. the General Fund, people who created the problem, or people who produced the products in an unsustainable way. Local governments joined together to form the California Product Stewardship Council, which looks at a different way of managing products through a cradle to cradle system that is dependent on a producer or product manufacturer collecting material and making it into something else. He reported that consumer products are now an enormous part of the waste stream and product waste is skyrocketing as a result.

Ms. Sushma Bhatia discussed the concept of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) or Product Stewardship, which is requiring manufacturers to share in the responsibility of recycling or disposing the product at the end of its life. She discussed why it is important, what has been done around the state to advocate for EPR initiatives, and where the City can take a leadership role to promote EPR at the local level. Topics of discussion included:

- The increase of product waste since 1960. (Slide 2)
- Change in the nature of products in the waste stream that contain toxic components and/or are single-use. (Slide 3)
- Producer Responsibility Definition. (Slide 4)
- Flow Chart of current and proposed system. (Slide 5)
- Voluntary and Mandatory Product Responsibility models to take back products. (Slides 6-7)
- State of EPR adoption in California for toxic products only. (Slide 8)
- Local Producer Responsibility Efforts. (Slide 9)
- Drug Take Back Program. (Slide 10)
- Local Collection of Hazardous Waste. (Slide 11)
- Local Priorities and Barriers to Producer Responsibility. (Slides 12-13)

Commissioner Gravanis reported that the Drug Enforcement Administration was sponsoring a "Drug Take Back Day" on October 29 and inquired about the amount of publicity for this program. Ms. Bhatia reported that "Drug Take Back Day" is being promoted and is a voluntary program sponsored in conjunction with state and local law enforcement for collection of controlled and non-controlled substances. The Drug Take Back pilot collection program will only be for non-controlled substances to be collected at some, but not all pharmacies, and may not be convenient for everyone. Deputy Director Assmann stated that consumers do not distinguish between controlled and non-controlled substances, and to have a more robust program, federal regulations would have to be changed in order to set up collection for both at pharmacies.

Commissioner Wald inquired about costs that are associated with these programs. Ms. Bhatia stated that consumers ultimately pay through taxes or garbage funds for disposal of the product, or the producer that collects the product will collect costs through an increase in the cost of the product. Deputy Director Assmann stated that the idea of EPR is to make it as efficient and low-cost as possible and would cost less than local government programs. Mr. Kevin Drew, Department of the Environment Zero Waste program staff, discussed the possibility of adding a fee or deposit to the sale of alkaline batteries in order to pay for recycling costs. A discussion was held on successful battery recycling programs that have been recently implemented, e.g. battery recycling collection buckets in apartment buildings and curbside collection.

Public Comment:

Ms. Lurilla Harris inquired about the disposition of the drugs that are turned in at collection sites. Ms. Bhatia reported that almost all medications are incinerated. Ms. Harris asked if incinerating the drugs would release toxins in the air. Ms. Bhatia stated that there are different types of landfills and incinerators that can be used to capture the dangerous chemicals.

Ms. Rebecca Evans inquired about the source of sharps and why they are considered contaminants. Ms. Bhatia explained that sharps are used to administer insulin and discussed safety concerns in the case when medicine is left in the sharp and improperly disposed of. A discussion was held about proper collection methods for sharps.

Mr. David Pilpel stated that EPR should be thought about in a more holistic way than just zero waste and toxics reduction. He suggested implementing "buy less" and "unburden your-self of your stuff" neighborhood campaigns through the integration of existing programs such as EnvironmentNow and Gigantic 3. Mr. Pilpel suggested that designated people be sent to people's homes and work with social service agencies to assist with campaigns and integrate strategies. Ms. Evans stated that outreach methods don't always reach tenants and discussed the amount of people with similar issues. Mr. Drew stated this topic involves consumer responsibility.

A discussion was held on next steps. Deputy Director Assmann stated that he would research whether adding a deposit on batteries is a legal option. He discussed analyses that could be implemented of how many batteries are sold in San Francisco, what other products are being collected, and what percentage of what products are being distributed. California sales figures could also be reviewed. Commissioner Wald suggested adding a point-of-sale fee on

alkaline batteries as a local ballot measure that could then be brought to the state level. Mr. Pilpel suggested putting informational signs (similar to the Cell Phone Ordinance sign approach) to educate the public about the disposal and feasibility of purchasing alkaline batteries as opposed to rechargeable battery alternatives. He suggested that the Department and Committee work on a Proposition 26 proposal to recommend to the Commission. Mr. Drew discussed Ontario, Canada's product stewardship efforts and discussions about implementing product bans. This agenda topic would be brought back to the Commission at a future date.

6. **Approval of a Resolution adopting as Commission policy an acknowledgement of the importance of protecting, restoring and enhancing San Francisco's indigenous biodiversity, and encouraging development staff to seek funding for biodiversity staffing and programs for recommendation to the Commission.** (Explanatory Document: Draft Resolution and Background) Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speakers: Commissioner Gravanis and David Assmann, Deputy Director. (Discussion and Action)

Commissioner Gravanis reported on the need for the Commission and the Department of the Environment to develop a biodiversity policy framework for restoring and protecting San Francisco's biodiversity. She explained that biodiversity is not only ecological restoration but includes protection of wildlife throughout the City, by means such as avoiding light pollution, designing building facades so as not to impair migratory birds, and regulating pesticides.

Commissioner Gravanis reported that the reason this effort has not been pursued before now is because of a lack of funding and resources. The Department's activities are funded by grants and contracts, and specific sources of funding are directed to specific projects. She suggested that development staff prioritize fundraising to employ staff with expertise in this area to launch programs and develop a plan for biological biodiversity. Activities that are currently taking place without funding include development of material to place on the Department's website and adding brochures about nature in the city to Eco Center shelf space.

Public Comment:

Ms. Rebecca Evans, on behalf of the Sierra Club, spoke in support of the Resolution and biodiversity policy. She agreed with the background document that states that not all invasive species are bad and stated that when looking at restoration or protection of resources, it is important to look at plants that may exist for the feeding of specific critters. Ms. Evans stated that she has seen a lot of degradation of resources in San Francisco, and supports a biodiversity policy.

Mr. David Pilpel agreed that the Commission on the Environment should not only be about the urban and built environment, but about the natural environment. He stated that an initial step is to have Department staff available to understand, comment and inform discussions. He pointed out that there are existing Department programs such as urban forestry and agriculture that could be integrated into this effort.

Mr. Damien Raffa, educator, spoke in the support of the Resolution and Biodiversity policy. He stated that this policy be in the portfolio of concerns for the Department of the Environment because of the relationship between the environment and protecting biodiversity on the

planet. A direct relationship to real nature is essential to make all environmental policies relevant, and it is important to protect the natural heritage and biological diversity that still exists in San Francisco. Mr. Raffa reported that he would gather support for this topic at the full Commission meeting on November 22, 2011 during public comment. Commissioner Gravanis discussed the potential concerns and misconceptions that have been expressed about this agenda topic.

Commissioner Wald motioned to recommend the Resolution with un-substantive word changes to the Commission's Consent Agenda. A discussion ensued about consent agenda procedures and the ability to have public comment in support of the Resolution. Commissioner Wald amended her original motion and motioned to approve the Resolution for recommendation to the Commission for its regular calendar, second by Commissioner Gravanis. (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash)

Items 7 and 8 were heard together.

7. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Explanatory Document: Outreach List) (Continued from the August 8, 2011 Meeting) Sponsors: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis (Informational Report, Discussion and Action)
8. **Purposes of Commission Outreach List and Criteria for Inclusion.** (Continued from the August 8, 2011 Meeting) Sponsor: Commissioner Ruth Gravanis; Speakers: Commissioner Gravanis and Director Nutter (Discussion and Action)

Commissioner Gravanis discussed the history of the outreach effort and outcome of the survey to environmental organizations that was sent in order to influence more active engagement between the Commission and environmental groups on activities and policy issues. She suggested revisiting the survey and responses to see if this process was an effective vehicle for accomplishing this effort.

Discussions were held on next steps to (1) revise the survey; (2) potentially employ volunteer staff to verify the accuracy of the expanded list of organizations and contacts; (3) access the Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services (MONS) list of environmental organizations once it has been established; (4) verify that the survey was sent to the Commission agenda mailing list; and (5) review the list that received the original survey, verify it was sent to the right people, and then follow-up on the responses to the survey.

Commissioner Wald proposed not expanding the current list at this time because of work by the Mayor's Office and overlap with the Community InSight project. She suggested focusing on the current Commission agenda mailing list and verifying that the right people from those organizations are receiving notices. Commissioner Wald suggested revisiting this issue at a future date to determine what impact the InSight project is having on public participation and the status of the Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services effort. Commissioner Wald suggested working with people who are involved in the America's Cup in the dialogue about what key issues the City should be working with others on. Commissioner Gravanis suggested also working with people who are involved in the Precautionary Principle.

Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel suggested sending a survey to the current Commission agenda mailing list asking to verify the contact person and whether there are other things that the Department, Commission and its Committees should be doing given their work in policy and oversight. He suggested that the Director and Deputy Director consider convening

periodic meetings of some number of organizations discussing both the organizations' and Department's activities and identifying what partnerships can be formed.

Deputy Director Assmann stated that this effort should be spearheaded by the Department's Outreach staff once the Project Manager and new staff members are on board. This agenda item was continued to the November 14, 2011 meeting to discuss next steps.

9. **Committee Suggestions for the Commission on the Environment 2011 Annual Report Content.** (Explanatory Document: Commission 2011 Annual Report Draft) (Discussion) Commissioner Wald asked that last week's carbon milestone and the Community InSight project topics be added to the 2011 Report. This agenda topic was continued to the November 14, 2011 meeting.

10. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Deputy Director Assmann for Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion) Deputy Director Assmann reported that there would be a hearing on October 25 from 5:30 – 7:00 p.m. at Pier 1 to share comments on the Draft America's Cup Sustainability Plan.

11. **Announcements.** (Discussion) There were no announcements made at this time.

12. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion) Commissioner Wald suggested that the November 14, 2011 meeting agenda include review of the Commission's 2011 Draft Annual Report and Commission Outreach discussion led by Deputy Director Assmann. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that the November 14 meeting include a discussion on the Balloon Release Ordinance.

    Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel inquired suggested additional discussion on Extended Producer Responsibility at the next meeting.

13. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

14. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393
The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 14, 2011at 5:00 p.m. in Room 421, City Hall.
** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee with each set of minutes, or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org.

Approved: November 14, 2011

SF *Environment*
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

11-09-11A08:16 RCVD

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

NOV - 9 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

3.71

14/11

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING AND AGENDA
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS
Public comment will be taken before the Committee takes action on any item.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.**
2. **Approval of Minutes of the October 24, 2011Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: October 24, 2011 Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)
3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
4. **State Legislative Updates on Zero Waste Legislation.** Sponsor: Melanie Nutter, Director; Staff Speakers: Guillermo Rodriguez and Jack Macy, Commercial Zero Waste Coordinator (10 minutes)(Informational Report and Discussion)
5. **Update on Draft Balloon Release Ordinance and Next Steps.** (Explanatory Documents: Commission 2000 Resolution, Board of Supervisors Draft Ordinance and Master Report File 002105) Staff Speaker: Guillermo Rodriguez (10 minutes) (Informational Report and Discussion)
6. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Continued from the October 24, 2011 Meeting) Sponsors: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Speaker: David Assmann, Deputy Director (10 minutes)(Informational Report and Discussion)
7. **Committee Suggestions for the Commission on the Environment 2011 Annual Report Content for recommendation to the Commission on the Environment.** (Continued from the October 24, 2011 meeting) (Explanatory Document: Commission 2011 Annual Report Draft) (30 minutes) (Discussion and Action)
8. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

9. **Announcements.** (Discussion)
10. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)
11. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
12. **Adjournment.**

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, December 12, 2011at 5:00 p.m., in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee , or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org within three business days of a meeting. If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Commission Policy Committee after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Department of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 during normal office hours or will be made available at the Policy Committee meeting website link https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee as attachments included with the agenda or meeting minutes.

Important Information

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the Committee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Committee members. Any written comments should be sent to: Commission Secretary of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Comments which cannot be delivered to the Commission Secretary by that time may be taken directly to the hearing at the location above. When bringing handouts to meetings, please photocopy on both sides of the paper and try to use post-consumer recycled or tree-free paper. Also, please bring sufficient copies of handouts for the Committee, the Commission Secretary and the public.

Public Comment

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but are not on today's agenda. Public comment will be taken following each agendized item. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes, unless otherwise announced by the Chair. If it is demonstrated that the

comments by the public will exceed 15 minutes, the Chair may continue Public Comment to another time during the meeting.

The Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue not appearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In response to public comment, not on an agendized item, the Committee is limited to:

1. Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
2. Request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
3. Directing staff to place the item or issue on a future agenda (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Disability Access

The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meeting will be held at City Hall, Room 421, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, in the Civic Center area. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the Civic Center Station at United Nations Plaza and Market Street. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro Stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For information about MUNI accessible services call (415) 923-6142. There is accessible curbside parking adjacent to City Hall on Grove Street and Van Ness Avenue and in the vicinity of the Veterans Building at 401 Van Ness Avenue adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Monica Fish at (415) 355-3709 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call the Mayor's Office on Disability at (415) 554-6789 or (415) 554-6799 (TTY) for further information.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance
(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Sunshine Task Force Administrator, City Hall, Room 409, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683 at Phone No.: (415) 554-7724; Fax No.: (415) 554-7854; E-mail: sotf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3112; web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Posted: November 8, 2011

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING DRAFT MINUTES
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:05 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Excused: Commissioner Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the October 24, 2011Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: October 24, 2011 Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the October 24, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection. (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash)

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.

   Ms. Lauren Spalter, San Francisco State University student, suggested implementing city, state, and national community service as a way to raise public awareness and to protect and restore the environment in a system similar to jury duty whereby there would be a requirement for five hours of community service a year as a civic duty.

   Committee Members and Deputy Director Assmann provided their input into new programs, educational campaigns and existing environmental projects that could potentially be tied into this concept. Director Nutter reported that the Department is in the process of hiring a

Department Grassroots Outreach Coordinator with the focus of integrating the EnvironmentNow team with volunteer efforts and amplifying work in the community.

Ms. Kelsey Wilson, San Francisco State University student, discussed the success of the plastic bag ban in reducing plastic litter and in educating the public about reducing consumption of items that damage the environment. She discussed the false advertising around many plastic products that are labeled as degradable and the impact of these products to marine animals and the environment. She suggested that additional efforts be made to further educate the public about the environmental impacts of the materials they consume and correct the misperceived idea of what degradability means for products that are labeled as such.

Mr. David Pilpel suggested publicizing and discouraging the use of certain chemicals that may cause problems in the environment and public works process. He stated that this effort is an opportunity for a partnership between Toxics Reduction and Public Utilities Commission staff. In reference to community service, Mr. Pilpel suggested that the Department's volunteer coordinator organize a supervised service-credit oriented volunteer program.

4. **State Legislative Updates on Zero Waste Legislation.** Sponsor: Melanie Nutter, Director; Staff Speakers: Guillermo Rodriguez and Jack Macy, Commercial Zero Waste Coordinator (Informational Report and Discussion)

Mr. Jack Macy reported on California legislation that has recently passed:

- SB567 Truthful Environmental Advertising in Plastics expands the scope of current plastic labeling requirements from bags and food containers to all plastic products. Commissioner Wald asked that this information be included in the Department and Commission's Annual Report.

- AB341, Solid Waste Diversion. Mandates recycling for multi-family buildings four-units or more and would require commercial recycling. This program has been implemented in San Francisco, but is now mandatory in California. CalRecycle is in charge of identifying a plan on how the state is going to reach 75% solid waste diversion. It extends the state's goal from 50 to 75% diversion and shifts responsibility from local governments to Cal Recycle. Director Nutter stated that she participated in a press conference today with the Department, environmental groups, and labor to discuss a report that was issued stating that if the nation were recycling and composting at a 75% diversion rate, 1.5 million jobs would be created. The report states that the bill is good not only for the environment, but for the economy and recycling.

- AB1149, California Beverage Container and Recycling and Litter Reduction Act. This bill extended a sunsetting bill to help facilitate more regional Plastic Market Development programs. This bill authorizes CalRecycle to invest 50% of the savings from PET processing into helping channel resources to plastic markets.

Mr. Macy reported that the Board of Supervisors Neighborhood Services and Operations Committee at its November 14 meeting approved extending the plastic bag ban to all retailers in the city. Certified compostable and plastic labeled properly will be allowed. Commissioner Wald suggested that a report be issued on the economic impact of the plastic bag ban. Mr. Macy discussed local jobs that have been created by companies that reuse old scrap cloth by making them into canvas bags.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether the Department was receiving support and coordination from environmental groups in order to maximize the success of bills. Mr. Macy discussed the support and compelling data that was put together by a coalition of groups on the food-ware ban that led to its success and continued support the Department is receiving. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that the Department submit articles to groups such as the Sierra Club and San Francisco Tomorrow who are always looking to publicize this type of information.

Mr. Guillermo Rodriguez discussed successful tactics that the Department utilizes and resources at its disposal in order to advance legislation through the Mayor, lobbyists in Sacramento and Washington, and within the City family. Commissioner Wald suggested that the Department also reach out to members of the Commission to gather support, and through Commission members, their networks.

Public Comment:

Ms. Ashley Pellouchond introduced herself as a third-year law student and bar-certified student clinician in the Environmental Law and Justice Clinic. She inquired about the legality and enforcement for false advertising of plastics claiming to be 100% biodegradable. Mr. Macy stated that a product has to be compostable in order to be biodegradable and discussed concerns in the area of cutlery that is oftentimes labeled as degradable when it is not compostable. Ms. Pellouchond inquired whether these companies can be sued for false advertising. Mr. Macy stated that he would like the Attorney General to enforce the truth in advertising legislation. Commissioner Wald suggested that a Department contact person be established to take calls about companies who are not in compliance.

Mr. David Pilpel suggested that the green business program be brought into this effort to educate businesses about their business practices and proper food disposal methods. He suggested that businesses work with manufacturers and distributors about the types of products they should be selling.

5. **Update on Draft Balloon Release Ordinance and Next Steps.** (Explanatory Documents: Commission 2000 Resolution, Board of Supervisors Draft Ordinance and Master Report File 002105) Sponsor: Commissioner Gravanis; Staff Speaker: Guillermo Rodriguez (Informational Report and Discussion)

Mr. Guillermo Rodriguez reported that the Commission on the Environment passed a Resolution eleven years ago urging the Board of Supervisors to pass an Ordinance prohibiting the mass release of balloons. From a review of historical records, the Ordinance did not advance further than being originally introduced and assigned to Committee. Deputy Director Assmann reported that there was no opposition to the content of the Board legislation at that time, but that it did not progress because Supervisor Katz had left the Board.

Mr. Rodriguez reported on legislation that exists in the Police Municipal Code prohibiting the mass release of balloons for advertising purposes without a permit, but explained that most people are unaware of this prohibition. He discussed the public opposition to the illegal release of balloons as part of an advertisement stunt early in March at the Moscone Center. There was no permit obtained from the Police Department, and a fine could have been

issued, or the District Attorney could have taken action. The result was bad press that caused the company that was hired to be liable for a lot of damages and cleanup costs.

Mr. Rodriguez reported that initial staff discussion about next steps would be to work with the Port in anticipation of the America's Cup and Opening Day celebrations to draft language to add to their lease agreements indicating express prohibition of mass release of balloons during the event. Another idea is to cite the current Police Code prohibition and add it into City department lease agreements and permits where mass balloon releases could be expected.

Committee Members discussed adding prohibitions into America's Cup vendor agreements and leases and implementing an educational and outreach campaign directed to the general public and organizations about balloon release permitting requirements and the dangers balloons cause to our oceans and sea-life. Commissioner Gravanis expressed her interest in seeing the lease and vendor agreements to identify who would be accountable, how enforcement would be handled, and penalties that would be issued. Commissioners discussed methods that could be used to ensure that vendors are not selling balloons at the America's Cup event. It was suggested that PG&E and other utility companies be contacted to gather their support since Mylar balloons can get caught in power lines and cause outages. Mr. Rodriguez reported that it is a state infraction to intentionally release a Mylar balloon.

Commissioner Gravanis spoke in favor of the proposed draft language that information should be made available to the renter of helium tanks and purchaser of helium-filled balloons at the time of sale, but is concerned with language that prohibits only mass releases, defined as more than 9 in a 24-hour period, and how that would be enforced. She suggested changing the language to no intentional release of balloons. Commissioner Wald stated that there is a need for enforcement in order for people to pay attention.

Director Nutter proposed legislation similar to pharmaceutical drug disposal legislation that mandates drug stores provide information on where to bring pharmaceuticals back. She suggested that there be outreach and education around the requirement for a permit that could be made available through retailers of the product at the point of sale. Commissioner Wald suggested identifying companies that rent or sell helium balloons and try a voluntary approach first before considering a mandatory approach. Commissioner Gravanis pointed out that if someone was unaware of the permit requirement, and a violation was issued by the police, they could go to the merchant and ask why they weren't informed. Deputy Director Assmann suggested that the Board of Supervisors pass legislation directed to all Commissions. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Pilpel explained that some Commissions have exclusive jurisdiction over their property, and the Board cannot influence their leases. Director Nutter suggested a Mayor's Directive.

Mr. Rodriguez was asked to provide input on next steps at future Policy Committee meetings.

Public Comment:

Mr. David Pilpel concurred with revising the draft Ordinance language to state intentional release of balloons and providing balloon-permitting information at the point of sale, but expressed his concern with the possibility of first amendment violations, as you cannot force merchants to participate if they choose not to. He suggested adding a requirement into city leases and agreements such as short and long-term real estate and Recreation and Park

Department rental agreements and working with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, and Coastal Commission on policy development. Mr. Pilpel reported that the Port Commission agenda and informational report on America's Cup project approvals does not reference the Department or the Commission as having project approval authority and suggested that the Commission provide input into the plans even if formal approval is not required. Director Nutter reported that the Port is the designated approval commission for the America's Cup event, and that only commissions named in the Host Agreement are required to provide approvals on specific plans.

Ms. Ashley Pellouchond stated that the intent requirement of releasing balloons is problematic and suggested fining anyone who releases balloons even if it is an accident.

6. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Continued from the October 24, 2011 Meeting) Sponsors: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Speaker: David Assmann, Deputy Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

   Deputy Director Assmann reported that an update would be provided to the Committee once the Department's Outreach team is in place and a strategy developed. Director Nutter reported that an announcement will be made shortly about the hiring of a 5644 Outreach Manager. It was suggested that this agenda item be tentatively continued to the February 13, 2012 Policy Committee meeting.

7. **Committee Suggestions for the Commission on the Environment 2011 Annual Report Content for recommendation to the Commission on the Environment.** (Continued from the October 24, 2011 meeting) (Explanatory Document: Commission 2011 Annual Report Draft) (Discussion and Action)

   Committee Members discussed actions that were taken by the Commission in formats other than Resolutions and suggested a future discussion be held on whether to use the Resolution format as a mechanism to adopt important policy statements and approvals such as budgets and the Department's Strategic Plan. Suggestions were provided in order to make changes to the organization and content of the report. Director Nutter reported that plans are to prepare a mid-year Strategic Plan and hold a review next spring in conjunction with the fiscal year. She stated that it would be a policy decision for the Commission to decide whether it wants to do a fiscal or calendar year Annual Report.

   Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether the Commission Operations Committee has the authority to issue approvals and asked for a future discussion about Commission and Committee approval procedures. Deputy Director Assmann reported that it was necessary for the Operations Committee to approve grant applications this year due to timing required for approvals.

   Ms. Fish reported that the Annual Report is submitted to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor and is part of the Department's Annual Report and Efficiency Plan, which is posted on the Department of the Environment's website. Committee members suggested that the Commission review the organization and content of the Annual Report at its November 22, 2011 meeting. A Draft of the Report would be reviewed by the Policy Committee at its December 12, 2011 meeting and would be brought back to the Commission for approval at

its January 24, 2011 meeting unless a decision is made to change the report to a fiscal-year format.

Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel reported that the Charter requirement is not specific as to whether the Commission's Annual report should be a calendar or fiscal-year report. He suggested a proposed schedule for review of the Annual Report by the Commission and its Committees, including more dialogue about Commission actions and priorities, and plans/challenges for 2012.

8. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion) Director Nutter

Director Nutter reported on conferences and press events that she recently attended and recent legislative activity at the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Wald asked that Director Nutter make a presentation to the full Commission about the Urban Environmental Accords Summit and next steps that are planned. Director Nutter announced that the Department will be holding a Holiday Open House and Volunteer Appreciation party on December 6 at the Eco Center from 5 – 7:30 p.m. She reported that she is instituting a high-level programmatic metrics document next month as part of the Commission's Director's Report.

Director Nutter announced that the America's Cup Zero Waste Plan Draft is scheduled for posting by the end of November. Committee Members requested that the America's Cup Sustainability Plan be scheduled for the November 22, 2011 Commission meeting as an informational report and discussion. A decision would be made as to whether to hold a special meeting on the Plan in December so that Commissioners can take possible action on the plan, or do so at the January 24, 2012 regular meeting. Committee Members requested that the Plan be provided to them in enough time for review before the meeting.

Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel encouraged Commissioners to keep the America's Cup Sustainability Plan on the November 22 Commission agenda for discussion and possible action and scheduling final action at the January Commission meeting. He suggested that the Policy Committee at its December meeting create a Resolution for the full Commission to consider in January. He asked Director Nutter to provide a written Director's Report to the Policy Committee on months when there isn't a full Commission meeting. Commissioner Gravanis requested more frequent updates on Department activities through a vehicle similar to senior staff reports, but not as detailed.

9. **Announcements.** (Discussion) Commissioner Wald announced communication she received that she had provided information on for a case study in San Francisco. Commissioner Gravanis reported the discovery of a new Monarch roosting site at Yerba Buena Island.

10. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion) Future agenda items suggested for the December 12, 2011 Policy Committee meeting include: (1) America's Cup update (2) banning the use of single-serve plastic water bottles in locations where a water supply is available; and (3) Commission Draft Annual Report review. Future agenda topics for the January 13, 2012 Policy Committee meeting include (1) Future Agenda Checklist Staff Assessment and Committee review; (2) Draft Climate Action Plan review; and (3) California Environmental Quality Act and other training for staff. Commissioner Gravanis requested (1) a status report at the February Policy Committee meeting on the Urban Forest Master Plan; (2) a future

discussion on proposed actions for sea level rise; and (3) a staff report on the best time to schedule discussions on the refuse rate process.

11. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

12. **Adjournment.** The Commission Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, December 12, 2011at 5:00 p.m., in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee with each set of minutes, or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org.

Approved:

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

DEC 13 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

3.71
11/4/11
approved

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING APPROVED MINUTES
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:05 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Excused: Commissioner Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the October 24, 2011Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: October 24, 2011 Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action) Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the October 24, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection. (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash)

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.

   Ms. Lauren Spalter, San Francisco State University student, suggested implementing city, state, and national community service as a way to raise public awareness and to protect and restore the environment in a system similar to jury duty whereby there would be a requirement for five hours of community service a year as a civic duty.

   Committee Members and Deputy Director Assmann provided their input into new programs, educational campaigns and existing environmental projects that could potentially be tied into this concept. Director Nutter reported that the Department is in the process of hiring a

Department Grassroots Outreach Coordinator with the focus of integrating the EnvironmentNow team with volunteer efforts and amplifying work in the community.

Ms. Kelsey Wilson, San Francisco State University student, discussed the success of the plastic bag ban in reducing plastic litter and in educating the public about reducing consumption of items that damage the environment. She discussed the false advertising around many plastic products that are labeled as degradable and the impact of these products to marine animals and the environment. She suggested that additional efforts be made to further educate the public about the environmental impacts of the materials they consume and correct the misperceived idea of what degradability means for products that are labeled as such.

Mr. David Pilpel suggested publicizing and discouraging the use of certain chemicals that may cause problems in the environment and public works process. He stated that this effort is an opportunity for a partnership between Toxics Reduction and Public Utilities Commission staff. In reference to community service, Mr. Pilpel suggested that the Department's volunteer coordinator organize a supervised service-credit oriented volunteer program.

4. **State Legislative Updates on Zero Waste Legislation.** Sponsor: Melanie Nutter, Director; Staff Speakers: Guillermo Rodriguez and Jack Macy, Commercial Zero Waste Coordinator (Informational Report and Discussion)

Mr. Jack Macy reported on California legislation that has recently passed:

- SB567 Truthful Environmental Advertising in Plastics expands the scope of current plastic labeling requirements from bags and food containers to all plastic products. Commissioner Wald asked that this information be included in the Department and Commission's Annual Report.

- AB341, Solid Waste Diversion. Mandates recycling for multi-family buildings four-units or more and would require commercial recycling. This program has been implemented in San Francisco, but is now mandatory in California. CalRecycle is in charge of identifying a plan on how the state is going to reach 75% solid waste diversion. It extends the state's goal from 50 to 75% diversion and shifts responsibility from local governments to Cal Recycle. Director Nutter stated that she participated in a press conference today with the Department, environmental groups, and labor to discuss a report that was issued stating that if the nation were recycling and composting at a 75% diversion rate, 1.5 million jobs would be created. The report states that the bill is good not only for the environment, but for the economy and recycling.

- AB1149, California Beverage Container and Recycling and Litter Reduction Act. This bill extended a sunsetting bill to help facilitate more regional Plastic Market Development programs. This bill authorizes CalRecycle to invest 50% of the savings from PET processing into helping channel resources to plastic markets.

Mr. Macy reported that the Board of Supervisors Neighborhood Services and Operations Committee at its November 14 meeting approved extending the plastic bag ban to all retailers in the city. Certified compostable and plastic labeled properly will be allowed. Commissioner Wald suggested that a report be issued on the economic impact of the plastic bag ban. Mr. Macy discussed local jobs that have been created by companies that reuse old scrap cloth by making them into canvas bags.

Commissioner Wald inquired whether the Department was receiving support and coordination from environmental groups in order to maximize the success of bills. Mr. Macy discussed the support and compelling data that was put together by a coalition of groups on the food-ware ban that led to its success and continued support the Department is receiving. Commissioner Gravanis suggested that the Department submit articles to groups such as the Sierra Club and San Francisco Tomorrow who are always looking to publicize this type of information.

Mr. Guillermo Rodriguez discussed successful tactics that the Department utilizes and resources at its disposal in order to advance legislation through the Mayor, lobbyists in Sacramento and Washington, and within the City family. Commissioner Wald suggested that the Department also reach out to members of the Commission to gather support, and through Commission members, their networks.

Public Comment:

Ms. Ashley Pellouchond introduced herself as a third-year law student and bar-certified student clinician in the Environmental Law and Justice Clinic. She inquired about the legality and enforcement for false advertising of plastics claiming to be 100% biodegradable. Mr. Macy stated that a product has to be compostable in order to be biodegradable and discussed concerns in the area of cutlery that is oftentimes labeled as degradable when it is not compostable. Ms. Pellouchond inquired whether these companies can be sued for false advertising. Mr. Macy stated that he would like the Attorney General to enforce the truth in advertising legislation. Commissioner Wald suggested that a Department contact person be established to take calls about companies who are not in compliance.

Mr. David Pilpel suggested that the green business program be brought into this effort to educate businesses about their business practices and proper food disposal methods. He suggested that businesses work with manufacturers and distributors about the types of products they should be selling.

5. **Update on Draft Balloon Release Ordinance and Next Steps.** (Explanatory Documents: Commission 2000 Resolution, Board of Supervisors Draft Ordinance and Master Report File 002105) Sponsor: Commissioner Gravanis; Staff Speaker: Guillermo Rodriguez (Informational Report and Discussion)

Mr. Guillermo Rodriguez reported that the Commission on the Environment passed a Resolution eleven years ago urging the Board of Supervisors to pass an Ordinance prohibiting the mass release of balloons. From a review of historical records, the Ordinance did not advance further than being originally introduced and assigned to Committee. Deputy Director Assmann reported that there was no opposition to the content of the Board legislation at that time, but that it did not progress because Supervisor Katz had left the Board.

Mr. Rodriguez reported on legislation that exists in the Police Municipal Code prohibiting the mass release of balloons for advertising purposes without a permit, but explained that most people are unaware of this prohibition. He discussed the public opposition to the illegal release of balloons as part of an advertisement stunt early in March at the Moscone Center. There was no permit obtained from the Police Department, and a fine could have been

issued, or the District Attorney could have taken action. The result was bad press that caused the company that was hired to be liable for a lot of damages and cleanup costs.

Mr. Rodriguez reported that initial staff discussion about next steps would be to work with the Port in anticipation of the America's Cup and Opening Day celebrations to draft language to add to their lease agreements indicating express prohibition of mass release of balloons during the event. Another idea is to cite the current Police Code prohibition and add it into City department lease agreements and permits where mass balloon releases could be expected.

Committee Members discussed adding prohibitions into America's Cup vendor agreements and leases and implementing an educational and outreach campaign directed to the general public and organizations about balloon release permitting requirements and the dangers balloons cause to our oceans and sea-life. Commissioner Gravanis expressed her interest in seeing the lease and vendor agreements to identify who would be accountable, how enforcement would be handled, and penalties that would be issued. Commissioners discussed methods that could be used to ensure that vendors are not selling balloons at the America's Cup event. It was suggested that PG&E and other utility companies be contacted to gather their support since Mylar balloons can get caught in power lines and cause outages. Mr. Rodriguez reported that it is a state infraction to intentionally release a Mylar balloon.

Commissioner Gravanis spoke in favor of the proposed draft language that information should be made available to the renter of helium tanks and purchaser of helium-filled balloons at the time of sale, but is concerned with language that prohibits only mass releases, defined as more than 9 in a 24-hour period, and how that would be enforced. She suggested changing the language to no intentional release of balloons. Commissioner Wald stated that there is a need for enforcement in order for people to pay attention.

Director Nutter proposed legislation similar to pharmaceutical drug disposal legislation that mandates drug stores provide information on where to bring pharmaceuticals back. She suggested that there be outreach and education around the requirement for a permit that could be made available through retailers of the product at the point of sale. Commissioner Wald suggested identifying companies that rent or sell helium balloons and try a voluntary approach first before considering a mandatory approach. Commissioner Gravanis pointed out that if someone was unaware of the permit requirement, and a violation was issued by the police, they could go to the merchant and ask why they weren't informed. Deputy Director Assmann suggested that the Board of Supervisors pass legislation directed to all Commissions. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Pilpel explained that some Commissions have exclusive jurisdiction over their property, and the Board cannot influence their leases. Director Nutter suggested a Mayor's Directive.

Mr. Rodriguez was asked to provide input on next steps at future Policy Committee meetings.

Public Comment:

Mr. David Pilpel concurred with revising the draft Ordinance language to state intentional release of balloons and providing balloon-permitting information at the point of sale, but expressed his concern with the possibility of first amendment violations, as you cannot force merchants to participate if they choose not to. He suggested adding a requirement into city leases and agreements such as short and long-term real estate and Recreation and Park

Department rental agreements and working with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, and Coastal Commission on policy development. Mr. Pilpel reported that the Port Commission agenda and informational report on America's Cup project approvals does not reference the Department or the Commission as having project approval authority and suggested that the Commission provide input into the plans even if formal approval is not required. Director Nutter reported that the Port is the designated approval commission for the America's Cup event, and that only commissions named in the Host Agreement are required to provide approvals on specific plans.

Ms. Ashley Pellouchond stated that the intent requirement of releasing balloons is problematic and suggested fining anyone who releases balloons even if it is an accident.

6. **Commission Outreach List Project Update.** (Continued from the October 24, 2011 Meeting) Sponsors: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Speaker: David Assmann, Deputy Director (Informational Report and Discussion)

Deputy Director Assmann reported that an update would be provided to the Committee once the Department's Outreach team is in place and a strategy developed. Director Nutter reported that an announcement will be made shortly about the hiring of a 5644 Outreach Manager. It was suggested that this agenda item be tentatively continued to the February 13, 2012 Policy Committee meeting.

7. **Committee Suggestions for the Commission on the Environment 2011 Annual Report Content for recommendation to the Commission on the Environment.** (Continued from the October 24, 2011 meeting) (Explanatory Document: Commission 2011 Annual Report Draft) (Discussion and Action)

Committee Members discussed actions that were taken by the Commission in formats other than Resolutions and suggested a future discussion be held on whether to use the Resolution format as a mechanism to adopt important policy statements and approvals such as budgets and the Department's Strategic Plan. Suggestions were provided in order to make changes to the organization and content of the report. Director Nutter reported that plans are to prepare a mid-year Strategic Plan and hold a review next spring in conjunction with the fiscal year. She stated that it would be a policy decision for the Commission to decide whether it wants to do a fiscal or calendar year Annual Report.

Commissioner Gravanis inquired whether the Commission Operations Committee has the authority to issue approvals and asked for a future discussion about Commission and Committee approval procedures. Deputy Director Assmann reported that it was necessary for the Operations Committee to approve grant applications this year due to timing required for approvals.

Ms. Fish reported that the Annual Report is submitted to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor and is part of the Department's Annual Report and Efficiency Plan, which is posted on the Department of the Environment's website. Committee members suggested that the Commission review the organization and content of the Annual Report at its November 22, 2011 meeting. A Draft of the Report would be reviewed by the Policy Committee at its December 12, 2011 meeting and would be brought back to the Commission for approval at

its January 24, 2011 meeting unless a decision is made to change the report to a fiscal-year format.

Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel reported that the Charter requirement is not specific as to whether the Commission's Annual report should be a calendar or fiscal-year report. He suggested a proposed schedule for review of the Annual Report by the Commission and its Committees, including more dialogue about Commission actions and priorities, and plans/challenges for 2012.

8. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion) Director Nutter

Director Nutter reported on conferences and press events that she recently attended and recent legislative activity at the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Wald asked that Director Nutter make a presentation to the full Commission about the Urban Environmental Accords Summit and next steps that are planned. Director Nutter announced that the Department will be holding a Holiday Open House and Volunteer Appreciation party on December 6 at the Eco Center from 5 – 7:30 p.m. She reported that she is instituting a high-level programmatic metrics document next month as part of the Commission's Director's Report.

Director Nutter announced that the America's Cup Zero Waste Plan Draft is scheduled for posting by the end of November. Committee Members requested that the America's Cup Sustainability Plan be scheduled for the November 22, 2011 Commission meeting as an informational report and discussion. A decision would be made as to whether to hold a special meeting on the Plan in December so that Commissioners can take possible action on the plan, or do so at the January 24, 2012 regular meeting. Committee Members requested that the Plan be provided to them in enough time for review before the meeting.

Public Comment: Mr. David Pilpel encouraged Commissioners to keep the America's Cup Sustainability Plan on the November 22 Commission agenda for discussion and possible action and scheduling final action at the January Commission meeting. He suggested that the Policy Committee at its December meeting create a Resolution for the full Commission to consider in January. He asked Director Nutter to provide a written Director's Report to the Policy Committee on months when there isn't a full Commission meeting. Commissioner Gravanis requested more frequent updates on Department activities through a vehicle similar to senior staff reports, but not as detailed.

9. **Announcements.** (Discussion) Commissioner Wald announced communication she received that she had provided information on for a case study in San Francisco. Commissioner Gravanis reported the discovery of a new Monarch roosting site at Yerba Buena Island.

10. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion) Future agenda items suggested for the December 12, 2011 Policy Committee meeting include: (1) America's Cup update (2) banning the use of single-serve plastic water bottles in locations where a water supply is available; and (3) Commission Draft Annual Report review. Future agenda topics for the January 13, 2012 Policy Committee meeting include (1) Future Agenda Checklist Staff Assessment and Committee review; (2) Draft Climate Action Plan review; and (3) California Environmental Quality Act and other training for staff. Commissioner Gravanis requested (1) a status report at the February Policy Committee meeting on the Urban Forest Master Plan; (2) a future

discussion on proposed actions for sea level rise; and (3) a staff report on the best time to schedule discussions on the refuse rate process.

11. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

12. **Adjournment.** The Commission Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, December 12, 2011at 5:00 p.m., in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee with each set of minutes, or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org.

Approved: December 12, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

12-08-11A11:16 RCVD

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

DEC - 8 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

3.71

12/12/11

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING AND AGENDA
MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS
Public comment will be taken before the Committee takes action on any item.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.**
2. **Approval of Minutes of the November 14, 2011Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: November 14, 2011Draft Minutes) (Discussion and Action)
3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
4. **Update on America's Cup Zero Waste Plan.** (Explanatory Document: Draft Zero Waste Plan) Speakers: Michael Martin, Project Director 34th America's Cup, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Alex Dmitriew Commercial Zero Waste Assistant Coordinator, Department of the Environment, Rich Berman, Utility Specialist, Port of San Francisco. (30 minutes) (Informational Presentation and Discussion)
5. **Committee Review of the Commission on the Environment 2011 Annual Report Draft Content for recommendation to the Commission on the Environment.** (Continued from the October 24, 2011 meeting) (Explanatory Document: Commission 2011 Annual Report Draft) (1 hour) (Discussion and Action)
6. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion)
7. **Announcements.** (Discussion)
8. **New Business/Future Agenda Items.** (Discussion)
9. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda.
10. **Adjournment.**

Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 9, 2012 at 5:00 p.m., in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee , or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org within three business days of a meeting. If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Commission Policy Committee after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Department of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 during normal office hours or will be made available at the Policy Committee meeting website link https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee as attachments included with the agenda or meeting minutes.

Important Information

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the Committee, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Committee members. Any written comments should be sent to: Commission Secretary of the Environment, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Comments which cannot be delivered to the Commission Secretary by that time may be taken directly to the hearing at the location above. When bringing handouts to meetings, please photocopy on both sides of the paper and try to use post-consumer recycled or tree-free paper. Also, please bring sufficient copies of handouts for the Committee, the Commission Secretary and the public.

Public Comment

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but are not on today's agenda. Public comment will be taken following each agendized item. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes, unless otherwise announced by the Chair. If it is demonstrated that the comments by the public will exceed 15 minutes, the Chair may continue Public Comment to another time during the meeting.

The Brown Act forbids the Committee from taking action or discussing any item or issue not appearing on the posted agenda. This rule applies to issues raised in public comment as well. In response to public comment, not on an agendized item, the Committee is limited to:

1. Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
2. Request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting, or
3. Directing staff to place the item or issue on a future agenda (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Disability Access

The Commission on the Environment Policy Committee Meeting will be held at City Hall, Room 421, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, in the Civic Center area. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the Civic Center Station at United Nations Plaza and Market Street. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro Stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For information about MUNI accessible services call (415) 923-6142. There is accessible curbside parking adjacent to City Hall on Grove Street and Van Ness Avenue and in the vicinity of the Veterans Building at 401 Van Ness Avenue adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex.

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Monica Fish at (415) 355-3709 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call the Mayor's Office on Disability at (415) 554-6789 or (415) 554-6799 (TTY) for further information.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance
(Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Sunshine Task Force Administrator, City Hall, Room 409, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683 at Phone No.: (415) 554-7724; Fax No.: (415) 554-7854; E-mail: sotf@sfgov.org. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100, et. seq] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Second Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100, fax (415) 252-3112; web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Posted: December 8, 2011

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

DEC 19 2011

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

71

12/11
draft

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING DRAFT MINUTES
MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:03 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Excused: Commissioner Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the November 14, 2011Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: November 14, 2011Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action). Commissioners Gravanis and Wald complimented Commission Secretary Fish for an outstanding job of condensing the meeting minutes into a shorter format that can be more difficult to accomplish than longer transcripts. Commissioner Gravanis did point out that a longer format can be beneficial to Commissioners who miss a meeting. Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the November 14, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash).

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. Ms. Lurilla Harris requested a future Policy Committee discussion about the Board of Supervisors proposed legislation opposing the sale of certain rodent control poisons.

4. **Update on America's Cup Zero Waste Plan.** (Explanatory Document: Draft Zero Waste Plan) Speakers: Michael Martin, Project Director 34th America's Cup, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Alex Dmitriew Commercial Zero Waste Assistant Coordinator, Department of the Environment, Rich Berman, Utility Specialist, Port of San Francisco. (Informational Presentation and Discussion)

   Mr. Michael Martin reported that the Zero Waste Plan is one of nine implementation plans called for in the America's Cup Host and Venue Agreement. The initial draft published in March was a broad overview of waste management strategies for the entire event area including spectator areas. The current draft, as required by the Host and Venue Agreement, targets only the Port venues where the events will be held rather than park areas. An articulation of how these strategies will be implemented along the waterfront will be before the Board of Supervisors as final approvals are sought.

   Mr. Martin discussed the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process as it relates to waste management strategies and potential mitigations for environmental impacts. Public and Policy Committee comments are to be incorporated into a revised Zero Waste Plan to be published in January with a further articulation of implementation strategies and how the City and Event Authority will develop a unified approach to what is called for in the plan.

   Mr. Alex Dmitriew provided historical context to how the Department of the Environment has implemented Zero Waste policies through provision of resources, training, education, and outreach to all City agencies associated with events, event producers, and green event organizers. He reported on updates contained in the Zero Waste Plan since it was first published in March and presented to the Committee at its April meeting. The implementation section on responsibilities has been eliminated pending further discussions, and sections on Waterfront Special Event Composting and Waste Reduction Policy, International Waste, Planning for Temporary Toilet Facilities for Event Venues, and estimated event costs have been added.

   Mr. Dmitriew reported on all applicable City Zero Waste ordinances and requirements that the America's Cup event is subject to, and the Department's work with America's Cup event organizers to provide outreach, education and training to event sponsors. He distributed the Department's Zero Waste Checklist provided to event organizers, producers, and City agencies to help set up a successful Zero Waste event in San Francisco. Mr. Dmitriew pointed out that the event contains a significant education and training component to promote marine stewardship and outreach to the public about the marine environment and how to best mitigate the impact of these events and personal actions.

   Mr. Rich Berman reported that based on the Department of the Environment's recommendations and goals to strengthen the City's Zero Waste goals, a proposal will be brought before the Port Commission as an informational item on December 16 to add a requirement to the Port's lease, license and permit agreements with event organizers that would "ensure that food waste streams from large outdoor events can be easily composted, and that marine life in the bay is protected from plastics and other litter." The proposal has been added to the Zero Waste Plan Section 3.2.6. Material will be available for public review on December 13, and plans are to bring the proposal back to the Port Commission for adoption on January 4, 2012. Director Nutter confirmed with Mr. Berman that it may be

possible to integrate the Port Commission's comments on the proposal into the Zero Waste Plan by December 31, the due date for public comment.

Commissioner Gravanis spoke in support of the Port's proposed Events Policy relative to the America's Cup and other future events and suggested that other City agencies adopt similar event practices. She provided suggestions for language, formatting and content of the Zero Waste Plan as follows:

- Correct the Table of Contents and pages with correct page numbers.
- Add the practice of reduce, reuse, and recycle as a main topic in the Table of Contents. Reusable products should be advocated for more than compostable and recyclable.
- Confirmed with Mr. Berman that the Port would be including a blanket prohibition on the intentional release of balloons due to its harmful effect on the marine environment.
- Insert stronger language in Section 3.2.6 about waste prevention methods changing the term "refrain from" to "prohibit" selling plastics to achieve a plastics-free event.
- Reinsert information contained in the March draft about implementation accountability and add funding sources and enforceability strategies.
- Require that compostable items be clearly labeled.
- Secure a commitment from licensed vendors that waste-prevention measures will be implemented before issuance of a permit.

Commissioner Gravanis questioned whether the Department of the Environment would be providing funding and staff resources to the America's Cup that would be diverted from other program work. She suggested that the Commission Operations Committee draft a budget and estimate of how much staff time and resources would be required. Director Nutter confirmed that the Department does not currently have a separate budget for the America's Cup.

Commissioner Wald spoke in support of the Port's proposal, but also suggested that the Port Commission strengthen the language in order to achieve the objective of zero waste. She suggested that (1) the Plan reference how the success of reaching the zero-waste goal would be measured and publicly reported on; and, (2) that an analysis be prepared on the period after the first set of races and races next year to determine the success of reaching current goals and setting future goals and expectations.

Mr. Dmitriew reported on the Plan's section on adaptive management and current protocols established with Recology to measure and document results of source separation. Commissioner Gravanis suggested also measuring the amount of waste that will end up in the bay and other locations. Commissioner Wald suggested that a beach cleanup event be scheduled after the America's Cup event. Mr. Dmitriew discussed interacting with other organizations involved with cleaning the bay on this effort that may already have existing baseline data to expand on.

Commissioner Gravanis suggested that the Event Authority commit to applying the same measures in Recreation and Park Department, state and federal lands and other areas that will be affected by this event. Commissioner Wald suggested involving other City agencies about what should be done and who would be responsible. Director Nutter reported that two department-head meetings were held focusing on the America's Cup as it relates to Port venues and would report back on discussions at future meetings.

Public Comment:

Mr. Steven Krefting spoke in support of Commissioner's comments.

Ms. Jill Savery, America's Cup Event Authority, stated that she recognizes the need for more specifics and metrics in the plan and reported on challenges that are faced due to timing of all the activities to allow the event to move forward, e.g., the Environmental Impact Report certification process, issuance of permits, and working with different agencies on the different venues.

5. **Committee Review of the Commission on the Environment 2011 Annual Report Draft Content for recommendation to the Commission on the Environment.** (Continued from the October 24, 2011 meeting) (Explanatory Document: Commission 2011 Annual Report Draft) (Discussion and Action). Commissioners and Director Nutter reviewed and revised the 2011 Draft Annual Report as will be reflected in the next reiteration of the Draft Report that will be presented to the Policy Committee for review and approval at its January 9, 2012 meeting. The Commission Operations Committee meeting is scheduled to review and approve its section at its January 18, 2012 meeting for recommendation to the Commission at its January 27, 2012 meeting.

   Public Comment:

   Mr. Steven Chiv confirmed that 1.55 million tons of material was diverted from landfill as an addition to the Annual Report. He expressed his gratitude to the Commission and Policy Committee members for their input into the environmental sustainability of the America's Cup.

   Ms. Lurilla Harris (1) encouraged the Department to generate more publicity about its brown bag events as a public education opportunity, (2) to provide more citywide information on the use of toxics products; and (3) provided editorial comments on the Annual Report.

Item 6 was heard before Item 5.

6. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion). Director Nutter (1) introduced Mr. Kevin Danaher, Outreach and Communications Program Manager for the Department of the Environment; and reported on (2) Board of Supervisors continuance of the plastic bag ban ordinance to allow for more outreach; (3) the success of the Department's holiday open house held last week and plans to continue quarterly open houses to continue to strengthen ties with the community and partners from the community; (4) World Green Building Council's award to San Francisco for having the best green building city policy; and (5) the Governor's conference in San Francisco on December 16 on "Climate Risks in California's Future." Commissioner Wald requested that Commissioners be added to the Department's press release list.

7. **Announcements.** (Discussion) Commissioner Gravanis announced (1) the Planning Commission's certification hearing of the America's Cup Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on December 15 at 5 p.m., (2) Port hearing on approval of EIR findings scheduled for December 16 at 10:15 a.m.; and (3) her attendance at the Mayor's Budget instruction meeting on December 16.

8. **New Business/Future Agenda Items** (Discussion). Commissioners suggested that the January 9 Policy Committee meeting include (1) the Annual Report revised draft; (2) America's Cup Zero Waste Plan update and response to Committee suggestions; and (3) Policy Committee focus in 2012 and Department staff input into priorities. Additional future agenda topics suggested include: (1) Climate Plan update; (2) Department Outreach vision; (3) Community InSight agenda topics to incorporate into Policy Committee agendas; (4) current staff development opportunities and recommendation to the Operations Committee to encourage staff development; (4) Planning Department presentation on the Recreation and Open Space Element revised Draft Plan; (5) Balloon Release Ordinance update; and (6) Biodiversity Resolution implementation plans.

   Public Comment: Mr. Forrest Hanson expressed his interest in energy conservation and green energy and finance.

9. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

10. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,
Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 9, 2012 at 5:00 p.m., in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee with each set of minutes, or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org.

Approved:

SF Environment
Our home. Our city. Our planet.

EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMISSION ON THE ENVIRONMENT
POLICY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING APPROVED MINUTES
MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2011, 5:00 P.M.

CITY HALL, ROOM 421
ONE DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT JR. PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS DEPT

JAN 10 2012

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Commissioners Johanna Wald (Chair), Ruth Gravanis (Vice-Chair), Rahul Prakash

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The Policy Committee meeting convened at 5:03 p.m. Present: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Excused: Commissioner Prakash.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the November 14, 2011Policy Committee Regular Meeting.** (Explanatory Document: November 14, 2011Draft and Approved Minutes) (Discussion and Action). Commissioners Gravanis and Wald complimented Commission Secretary Fish for an outstanding job of condensing the meeting minutes into a shorter format that can be more difficult to accomplish than longer transcripts. Commissioner Gravanis did point out that a longer format can be beneficial to Commissioners who miss a meeting. Upon Motion by Commissioner Gravanis, second by Commissioner Wald, the November 14, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved without objection (AYES: Commissioners Wald and Gravanis; Absent: Commissioner Prakash).

3. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. Ms. Lurilla Harris requested a future Policy Committee discussion about the Board of Supervisors proposed legislation opposing the sale of certain rodent control poisons.

4. **Update on America's Cup Zero Waste Plan.** (Explanatory Document: Draft Zero Waste Plan) Speakers: Michael Martin, Project Director 34th America's Cup, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Alex Dmitriew Commercial Zero Waste Assistant Coordinator, Department of the Environment, Rich Berman, Utility Specialist, Port of San Francisco. (Informational Presentation and Discussion)

   Mr. Michael Martin reported that the Zero Waste Plan is one of nine implementation plans called for in the America's Cup Host and Venue Agreement. The initial draft published in March was a broad overview of waste management strategies for the entire event area including spectator areas. The current draft, as required by the Host and Venue Agreement, targets only the Port venues where the events will be held rather than park areas. An articulation of how these strategies will be implemented along the waterfront will be before the Board of Supervisors as final approvals are sought.

   Mr. Martin discussed the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process as it relates to waste management strategies and potential mitigations for environmental impacts. Public and Policy Committee comments are to be incorporated into a revised Zero Waste Plan to be published in January with a further articulation of implementation strategies and how the City and Event Authority will develop a unified approach to what is called for in the plan.

   Mr. Alex Dmitriew provided historical context to how the Department of the Environment has implemented Zero Waste policies through provision of resources, training, education, and outreach to all City agencies associated with events, event producers, and green event organizers. He reported on updates contained in the Zero Waste Plan since it was first published in March and presented to the Committee at its April meeting. The implementation section on responsibilities has been eliminated pending further discussions, and sections on Waterfront Special Event Composting and Waste Reduction Policy, International Waste, Planning for Temporary Toilet Facilities for Event Venues, and estimated event costs have been added.

   Mr. Dmitriew reported on all applicable City Zero Waste ordinances and requirements that the America's Cup event is subject to, and the Department's work with America's Cup event organizers to provide outreach, education and training to event sponsors. He distributed the Department's Zero Waste Checklist provided to event organizers, producers, and City agencies to help set up a successful Zero Waste event in San Francisco. Mr. Dmitriew pointed out that the event contains a significant education and training component to promote marine stewardship and outreach to the public about the marine environment and how to best mitigate the impact of these events and personal actions.

   Mr. Rich Berman reported that based on the Department of the Environment's recommendations and goals to strengthen the City's Zero Waste goals, a proposal will be brought before the Port Commission as an informational item on December 16 to add a requirement to the Port's lease, license and permit agreements with event organizers that would "ensure that food waste streams from large outdoor events can be easily composted, and that marine life in the bay is protected from plastics and other litter." The proposal has been added to the Zero Waste Plan Section 3.2.6. Material will be available for public review on December 13, and plans are to bring the proposal back to the Port Commission for adoption on January 4, 2012. Director Nutter confirmed with Mr. Berman that it may be

possible to integrate the Port Commission's comments on the proposal into the Zero Waste Plan by December 31, the due date for public comment.

Commissioner Gravanis spoke in support of the Port's proposed Events Policy relative to the America's Cup and other future events and suggested that other City agencies adopt similar event practices. She provided suggestions for language, formatting and content of the Zero Waste Plan as follows:

- Correct the Table of Contents and pages with correct page numbers.
- Add the practice of reduce, reuse, and recycle as a main topic in the Table of Contents. Reusable products should be advocated for more than compostable and recyclable.
- Confirmed with Mr. Berman that the Port would be including a blanket prohibition on the intentional release of balloons due to its harmful effect on the marine environment.
- Insert stronger language in Section 3.2.6 about waste prevention methods changing the term "refrain from" to "prohibit" selling plastics to achieve a plastics-free event.
- Reinsert information contained in the March draft about implementation accountability and add funding sources and enforceability strategies.
- Require that compostable items be clearly labeled.
- Secure a commitment from licensed vendors that waste-prevention measures will be implemented before issuance of a permit.

Commissioner Gravanis questioned whether the Department of the Environment would be providing funding and staff resources to the America's Cup that would be diverted from other program work. She suggested that the Commission Operations Committee draft a budget and estimate of how much staff time and resources would be required. Director Nutter confirmed that the Department does not currently have a separate budget for the America's Cup.

Commissioner Wald spoke in support of the Port's proposal, but also suggested that the Port Commission strengthen the language in order to achieve the objective of zero waste. She suggested that (1) the Plan reference how the success of reaching the zero-waste goal would be measured and publicly reported on; and, (2) that an analysis be prepared on the period after the first set of races and races next year to determine the success of reaching current goals and setting future goals and expectations.

Mr. Dmitriew reported on the Plan's section on adaptive management and current protocols established with Recology to measure and document results of source separation. Commissioner Gravanis suggested also measuring the amount of waste that will end up in the bay and other locations. Commissioner Wald suggested that a beach cleanup event be scheduled after the America's Cup event. Mr. Dmitriew discussed interacting with other organizations involved with cleaning the bay on this effort that may already have existing baseline data to expand on.

Commissioner Gravanis suggested that the Event Authority commit to applying the same measures in Recreation and Park Department, state and federal lands and other areas that will be affected by this event. Commissioner Wald suggested involving other City agencies about what should be done and who would be responsible. Director Nutter reported that two department-head meetings were held focusing on the America's Cup as it relates to Port venues and would report back on discussions at future meetings.

Public Comment:

Mr. Steven Krefting spoke in support of Commissioner's comments.

Ms. Jill Savery, America's Cup Event Authority, stated that she recognizes the need for more specifics and metrics in the plan and reported on challenges that are faced due to timing of all the activities to allow the event to move forward, e.g., the Environmental Impact Report certification process, issuance of permits, and working with different agencies on the different venues.

5. **Committee Review of the Commission on the Environment 2011 Annual Report Draft Content for recommendation to the Commission on the Environment.** (Continued from the October 24, 2011 meeting) (Explanatory Document: Commission 2011 Annual Report Draft) (Discussion and Action). Commissioners and Director Nutter reviewed and revised the 2011 Draft Annual Report as will be reflected in the next reiteration of the Draft Report that will be presented to the Policy Committee for review and approval at its January 9, 2012 meeting. The Commission Operations Committee meeting is scheduled to review and approve its section at its January 18, 2012 meeting for recommendation to the Commission at its January 27, 2012 meeting.

   Public Comment:

   Mr. Steven Chiv confirmed that 1.55 million tons of material was diverted from landfill as an addition to the Annual Report. He expressed his gratitude to the Commission and Policy Committee members for their input into the environmental sustainability of the America's Cup.

   Ms. Lurilla Harris (1) encouraged the Department to generate more publicity about its brown bag events as a public education opportunity, (2) to provide more citywide information on the use of toxics products; and (3) provided editorial comments on the Annual Report.

Item 6 was heard before Item 5.

6. **Director's Report and Updates.** Speaker: Melanie Nutter, Director (Informational Report and Discussion). Director Nutter (1) introduced Mr. Kevin Danaher, Outreach and Communications Program Manager for the Department of the Environment; and reported on (2) Board of Supervisors continuance of the plastic bag ban ordinance to allow for more outreach; (3) the success of the Department's holiday open house held last week and plans to continue quarterly open houses to continue to strengthen ties with the community and partners from the community; (4) World Green Building Council's award to San Francisco for having the best green building city policy; and (5) the Governor's conference in San Francisco on December 16 on "Climate Risks in California's Future." Commissioner Wald requested that Commissioners be added to the Department's press release list.

7. **Announcements.** (Discussion) Commissioner Gravanis announced (1) the Planning Commission's certification hearing of the America's Cup Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on December 15 at 5 p.m., (2) Port hearing on approval of EIR findings scheduled for December 16 at 10:15 a.m.; and (3) her attendance at the Mayor's Budget instruction meeting on December 16.

8. **New Business/Future Agenda Items** (Discussion). Commissioners suggested that the January 9 Policy Committee meeting include (1) the Annual Report revised draft; (2) America's Cup Zero Waste Plan update and response to Committee suggestions; and (3) Policy Committee focus in 2012 and Department staff input into priorities. Additional future agenda topics suggested include: (1) Climate Plan update; (2) Department Outreach vision; (3) Community InSight agenda topics to incorporate into Policy Committee agendas; (4) current staff development opportunities and recommendation to the Operations Committee to encourage staff development; (4) Planning Department presentation on the Recreation and Open Space Element revised Draft Plan; (5) Balloon Release Ordinance update; and (6) Biodiversity Resolution implementation plans.

   Public Comment: Mr. Forrest Hanson expressed his interest in energy conservation and green energy and finance.

9. **Public Comments:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. There was no public comment at this time.

10. **Adjournment.** The Policy Committee meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,
Monica Fish, Commission Secretary
Telephone (415) 355-3709; Fax (415) 554-6393

The next Commission on the Environment Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 9, 2012 at 5:00 p.m., in Room 421, City Hall.

** Copies of explanatory documents are available at (1) the Commission's office, 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, California between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., (2) on the Policy Committee's website https://sites.google.com/a/sfenvironment.org/commission/policy-committee with each set of minutes, or (3) upon request to the Commission Secretary at telephone number 415-355-3709, or via e-mail at Monica.Fish@sfgov.org.

Approved: January 9, 2012

Houchen
Bindery Ltd